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From the Editor

Spring is in the air and the season of renewal is upon us. I hope that you will take the time to refresh your professional perspectives with some of the offerings of this issue. Again, the subject scope is varied and ideas from the submissions can be applied to many libraries. I also hope that you or your colleagues will consider publication in *The Southeastern Librarian*. You do not have to be a member of the organization to be considered. Over the past two years, the journal has had an acceptance rate of 64%. In the spring of 2012, the journal was added to the Kennesaw State University repository and downloads have averaged 770 per month.

In their article “The Journal-Based Publishing Activity of Tennessee Academic Librarians, 2007-2011” Susan Wood and Betsy Park summarize research within Tennessee and how that compares to past scholarship as well as scholarship at a broader level. This analysis is beneficial for other academic librarians in the region in order to assess their own individual and institutional activities. Diana Reid and Margo Smith discuss a method of collection size analysis in their article “Measuring (the value of) Space: A Case Study of Collaborative Assessment of an Academic Library’s Physical Collection”. Their findings can be utilized in almost any size and type of library.

Anthony Holdereid discusses starting a new literacy program in his article entitled “Starting From Scratch: Implementing a Successful Multifaceted Information Literacy Program for the First-Year Course”. This article brings a fresh perspective on a popular program. By contrast, Andrea Brooks concentrates on a particular aspect of information literacy in her submission “Maximizing One-Shot Impact: Using Pre-Test Responses in the Information Literacy Classroom.” This article is based on a presentation given by Ms. Brooks at a recent SELA conference as winner of the SELA New Voices Program. Finally, Amy Butler and Leigh Thompson address their experiences in setting up a discovery product in “Implementing Discovery at the University of North Alabama”. Anyone looking into implementing such a product or migrating from one product to another will find this information useful.

Enjoy the issue and have a great summer!

Perry Bratcher
Editor

Susan Wood and Betsy Park

Susan Wood is an Interlibrary Loan Librarian at the University of Memphis Libraries and can be reached at swood1@memphis.edu. Betsy Park is an Assistant to the Dean at the University of Memphis Libraries and can be reached at ehpark@memphis.edu.

Introduction

Analysis of scholarly production and communication is of widespread interest in higher education. In the field of Library and Information Sciences (LIS), authorship studies provide insight into the range of the professional activities of librarians, describe characteristics of the landscape of librarians’ scholarly output, and identify factors that affect research and publication activities. As Sassen (2011) has noted, authorship studies document “the sociological characteristics of the literature of a discipline” (p. 73). These studies describe a profile of who publishes in the discipline, their gender, occupation, place of employment, and whether these authors publish singly or with others. This information is useful for developing a complete picture of academic librarianship as a profession, as well as for identifying norms of scholarly output. Librarians who are evaluated by non-library faculty and administrators on the basis of scholarly output need to be able to communicate the standards in the field across the institution.

This study provides a detailed view of the journal publication activities of academic librarians in Tennessee for the five-year period from 2007 through 2011. The authors are interested in developing a picture of the journal-based publication activities of this group of people in order to benchmark against previous studies and to contribute to an understanding of the publication activity of academic librarians. The trends identified will be useful for new professionals entering the field in positions that require publication for continued employment, as well as for those who are interested in a snapshot of recent journal publication activity of Tennessee academic librarians. Findings include: women are publishing in the journal literature in proportion to their overall numbers in the field, Tennessee Libraries is the most popular publication outlet for academic librarians in the state, and the authors in the sample, representing approximately 23% of the state’s academic librarians, published on average 1.21 articles each during this period.

Literature Review

The research and publication activities of librarians have been studied from a variety of perspectives. Nisonger (1996) identified a useful typology of authorship study methods. The first approach is that of database- and journal-based studies in which researchers examine a selection of citations over a period of time or the contents of specific journals in order to identify characteristics of contributors. The second approach is that of individual-based studies in which researchers use questionnaires or similar tools to elicit information about publication activities from a particular group of people, such as librarians in a specific region or at selected institutions. This study combines these two approaches.

Although it is not possible to make direct comparisons among authorship studies because of different methods, populations and timeframes, common themes emerge. Looking at author productivity, several researchers have found that most authors have written approximately one article over a typical five-year period (Best & Kneip, 2010; Davarpanah & Aslektia, 2008; Joswick, 1999; Weller, Hurd, & Webster, 2007; Wiberley, Hurd, & Weller, 2006; Zemon & Bahr, 1998). Fennenwald (2008) gathered data from the curricula vitae of Penn State librarians and reported that the average librarian wrote 1.9 articles during time spent at the institution. Weller, Hurd, and Wiberley (1999) analyzed 32 peer-reviewed LIS journals between 1993 and 1997 and found that 43.6% of the articles had an academic librarian author. However, when they repeated their study for 1998 to 2002, they reported a decline of almost 4% of such articles (Wiberley, Hurd, & Weller, 2006). On the other hand, a 2010 study of librarians at Oregon State University reported a general upward trend in peer-reviewed articles over a ten-year period (Wirth, Kelly, & Webster, 2010). Hildreth and Aytac (2007) examined articles published in 23 LIS journals between 2003 and 2005 and found that 43.2% were written by practicing librarians alone and another 9.71% by a combination of practicing librarians and faculty in LIS programs. Recent research has indicated that “almost 77% of...USAL [U.S. academic librarians] published one article in the 9-year period” from 2003-2011 (Blecic et al., 2012, June). Kennedy and Brancolini (2012) surveyed the research activity of academic librarians since finishing their Master of Library Science (MLS) degrees. These investigators reported that 62% of the respondents had performed research, but only 77% of these researchers had
disseminated the results of their research as a published article, conference presentation, or the like.

Several investigators have examined the role of collaboration in research and publishing. Terry (1996) reported a dramatic increase in co-authorship in College & Research Libraries from less than 5% in 1939 to almost 60% in 1994. Bahr and Zemon (2000) noted that between 1986 and 1996 40% of the articles in College & Research Libraries and 29% of those in the Journal of Academic Librarianship were co-authored. When Hart (1999; 2007) gathered information from librarians at Penn State, he found that almost 88% had co-authored at least one article. Weller, Hurd, and Wiberley (1999) found that 55.03% of the articles published from 1993 to 1997 in their sample of 32 peer-reviewed LIS journals were co-authored, but when they repeated their study only 41.09% of those published from 1998 to 2002 were written collaboratively (Wiberley, Hurd, & Weller, 2006). They suggested that future research would need to be done to determine if this was a temporary decline or representative of a trend.

Other variables that have been widely studied are job title and institutional size. One study of authorship in sixteen LIS journals described the most prolific writers as faculty teaching in LIS programs, followed by reference and public service librarians, and by library (Buttlar, 1991). Subsequent research has shown that among academic librarians, public service librarians and administrators have been the most productive (Fennewald, 2008; Joswick, 1999; Zemon & Bahr, 1998). With relation to institutional size, studies have found that most authors work at large research institutions (Hardin & Stankus, 2011; 2012; Seaman, 2008; Weller, Hurd, & Wiberley, 1999; Wiberley, Hurd, & Weller, 2006).

The gender of authors is another demographic factor frequently investigated. Taking a journal-based approach in their landmark study, Olsgaard and Olsgaard (1980) developed what has come to be known as the Olsgaard Profile of librarian authors, finding that male affiliated with institutions located in the Northeast and Midwest regions of the United States were over-represented as authors in the top LIS journals compared to their relative numbers in the field. Adamson and Zamora (1981) and Buttlar (1991) had similar findings, and Terry’s (1996) study of authors in College & Research Libraries from 1989 to 1994 showed females made up 51.7% of total contributors, which, while an increase in overall numbers, still pointed to an over-representation of male authors. Zemon and Bahr’s (1998) analysis of articles by college librarians in College & Research Libraries and Journal of Academic Librarianship from 1986 to 1996 showed an almost equal number written by females as by males. As women dominate the field of librarianship in numbers, these studies again point to an over-representation of male authors. Joswick (1999) studied the scholarly output of academic librarians in Illinois and determined that the gender gap in publishing was closing. Goedeken (2006) studied authorship in the Serials Librarian and Sassen (2009) in the Indexer and both reported a steady increase in the percentage of articles written by females.

The impact of institutional requirements and work cultures on the publication activities of librarians has also been a factor of interest in authorship studies, though the current study does not investigate them. Rayman and Goudy (1980) examined the research and publication requirements for the then 94 Association of Research Libraries (ARL) members and found that just 15% of them required librarians to publish as a condition of continued employment, while 60% encouraged publication. A decade later, Budd and Seavey (1990) surveyed the affiliations of the most productive authors in 36 LIS journals and reported that 82.3% of their institutions required publication for tenure and 88.2% required publication for promotion. Park and Riggs (1991) found that of the 304 academic libraries they surveyed, 74% indicated that librarians were evaluated at least in part on the basis of research and publication output. Blessinger and Costello (2011) surveyed 25 ARL libraries and reported that in the current recession, monetary support for professional activities had largely decreased, while expectations for tenure and promotion, including research and publication, had not changed. Black and Leysen (1994) identified factors that promoted librarians’ publication activities, such as a daily schedule in which librarians were relieved from routine service responsibilities and the importance of mentoring, and Cirasella and Smale (2011) also pointed to the importance of peer-mentoring in encouraging research activities. In a qualitative study of Penn State librarians, Fennewald (2008) identified a number of factors related to institutional culture that promoted research and publication including mentoring, the availability of release time, and an overall culture that placed high value on publication as a professional activity.

One article deserves a closer look because it spurred the writers’ interest and formed the basis for the research reported here. In 1999, Joswick reported a survey of journal articles written by practicing academic librarians in Illinois between 1995 and January 1999. The average number of articles published per author was 1.26. Women were publishing in proportion to their numbers in the profession, more articles were written collaboratively than had previously been reported, and women were more likely than men to collaborate. She also found that the most productive authors were library administrators, reference librarians, and branch or department librarians. These productive authors were also more likely to work in large research universities than in colleges. The current study replicates Joswick’s study for librarians in Tennessee. It contributes to the literature of authorship and provides a publication benchmark for librarians practicing in Tennessee.

Method

This research describes author characteristics of practicing academic librarians in Tennessee who published in the journal literature from 2007 through 2011. Citations for this sample were collected by searching ISI’s Web of Science database for authors identified as working in an academic library in Tennessee. Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts (EBSCO) and Wilson’s
OmniFile Full Text Mega (which includes Library Literature Full Text) were also searched for variations of “library” or “librarian” and “Tennessee.” In order to compile as comprehensive a sample as possible, a request was also sent to the Tennessee Library Association’s listserv, TLA-L, to identify additional article references meeting the criteria.

The scope of this study is limited to practicing librarians at public and private colleges and universities in Tennessee. Library deans and directors at Tennessee libraries were included, but faculty in LIS programs, non-MLS authors, and authors living outside Tennessee were excluded. For each article the following information was gathered: author(s), institution, position, sex, and journal title. Only substantive research articles were included in the count; book reviews, columns, letters to the editors, and the like were excluded. While each practicing librarian author in co-authored articles was counted, articles were counted only once. Information on faculty status was not gathered and therefore not considered in this analysis. The information was entered into a spreadsheet for analysis.

Findings

Using the methods described above, 139 articles written by 115 individual authors were identified. Approximately 23% of the 509 academic librarians in Tennessee (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2011) wrote at least one article during the five-year period covered by the study. The number of articles per author ranged from one to 10, with an average of 1.21 articles per author. A majority of librarians who published in this time period wrote one article (67 or 58%), 28 (2%) wrote two articles, and 14 (17%) wrote three to four articles. The remaining six librarians, the most prolific, wrote from five to 10 articles each (See Table 1).

These numbers compare with Joswick’s (1999) five-year study of Illinois librarians (average of 1.27 articles) and Best and Kneip’s (2010) survey of five years of College & Research Libraries and the Journal of Academic Librarianship (average of 1.256 articles). Tennessee librarians publish slightly fewer articles than reported by these researchers. Additional research with other populations is needed to discover if the lower average is particular to Tennessee or typical of other groups.

Sixty-six (47%) of the 139 articles were written by only one author; 32 (23%) had two authors; 28 (20%) had three authors, with the remaining 13 (>0.1%) articles having four to six authors. Slightly more than half of all articles in this sample were co-authored, with an average of 1.96 authors each. Other studies (Bahr & Zemon, 2000; Hart, 2007) identify a trend toward collaboration in a variety of disciplines, including LIS. Recently published Tennessee authors appear to embrace this trend.

The sex of the authors was determined by examining the authors’ first names. In the case of ambiguous names, the web was searched to locate biographical information, a picture, a pronoun used in correspondence, or some other information to aid in determination. Ninety-three (81%) of the 115 authors were female and 22 (19%) were male, indicating that females in this study published about four times more than their male counterparts, which is in proportion to the overall make-up of the profession. Although there is no known data on the ratio of female to male academic librarians in Tennessee specifically, women comprise approximately 81% of the overall population of librarians (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Economic and Statistics, Bureau of the Census, 2011). Echoing these findings, a recent American Library Association (ALA) demographic report identified 80.7% of ALA members as female (March 2012). Previous studies have shown that men have been over-represented as authors in the LIS literature (Burlingame & Repp, 1982; Olsgaard & Olsgaard, 1980), but over the last 10-15 years, the trend is clearly shifting toward parity in representation. Again Tennessee librarian authors appear to follow this trend.

Occupational title is another characteristic that is of interest in authorship studies. Do librarians in certain positions publish more than others? The author’s job title was collected as identified in the article byline. If no job title was included, the institution’s website was checked to determine the author’s position. Using this process the title of all but one librarian was identified. There is little similarity among librarians’ job titles, making it difficult to compare titles across institutions. In addition, the current job title as found on the institutions’ websites is not necessarily the position held by the author at the time of publication. With these limitations in mind, titles were standardized and coded accordingly. For example, a music librarian was coded as a branch librarian, although at another institution, a music librarian might be identified as a collection development librarian or cataloger specializing in music. As shown in Table 2, by far the most active groups are librarians who work in reference/public service positions (23%). It is surprising that only 6% of the authors in this study hold administrative positions, since administrators in other studies were more active (Burlingame & Repp, 1982; Joswick, 1999; Zemon & Bahr, 1998). Further research might investigate these differences.

Are librarians at certain institutions more productive than those at other institutions? Does institutional size and classification matter? The authors’ home institutions were recorded and analyzed according to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (2010). The authors worked at 25 different colleges and universities, mostly at publically-funded state institutions. As can be seen in Table 3, the majority of the authors worked at large research universities with high or very high research activity (University of Tennessee–Knoxville, Vanderbilt University, and University of Memphis). The next largest groups were employed by doctoral and large master’s degree granting institutions. These findings support other studies’ conclusions that “publication in the professional literature is considered primarily an accomplishment of university, not college, librarians” (Zemon & Bahr, 1998 p. 421). Because the current study
did not investigate faculty status or other factors that might contribute to research productivity, the authors can only speculate on why this occurs. Librarians at the University of Tennessee and the University of Memphis are tenure-track with a research and publication requirement. Although librarians at Vanderbilt are not tenure-track, in a recent report they ranked within the top 15 of most productive libraries (Blecic, et al., 2012, June). Larger institutions may have more staff and resources than smaller institutions, presumably making it easier for librarians who want to write to do so. However, librarians at these large institutions serve a large clientele and may have additional job responsibilities. It might be that there are other factors, such as mentoring and release time, that engender a climate encouraging librarians to publish, as Hart (1999) has suggested at Penn State.

Librarians in this study published in 47 journals. Although the research was not limited to LIS titles, only five were non-LIS titles. The non-LIS titles included one from an osteopathic association, one from a publisher’s association, one from consumer health, and two from education. As might be expected, the most frequent outlet was *Tennessee Libraries*, the peer-reviewed professional journal of the Tennessee Library Association. Forty-seven articles (34%) were published in this one journal. An earlier study of authorship in *Tennessee Libraries* found that the majority of authors in the journal were academic librarians (Park, 2001). This title, plus the *Journal of the Medical Library Association* (with 14 articles) and *Library Journal* (with seven articles) account for approximately half of the articles published by Tennessee librarians.

The latter two of these three journals are included in the most recent Social Sciences Edition (2011) of ISI’s Journal Citation Reports (JCR) for that database’s subject category of information science and library science. Journals included in JCR are considered the leading journals in their fields, and metrics related to the impact and influence of these journals as calculated by JCR are used as a measure of a given journal’s importance as a venue for scholarly communication. The 2011 Social Sciences Edition includes 83 journals in the subject category for information science and library science, many of which represent the field of management information systems (MIS). Though there is certainly overlap in the research agendas in MIS and LIS, these are nevertheless separate fields. Thus combining these fields into one subject category in JCR for the purpose of ranking and comparison of journals lessens JCR’s utility.

The remaining 50% of the 115 articles were published in journals covering a variety of subjects. Twenty-six of the remaining 44 journals contained a single article, while 18 included from two to four articles. Via (1996) has noted “a veritable explosion of new [LIS] periodicals devoted to ever-narrower subtopics of library and information science” (p. 365). Via attributes this development, at least in part, to a perceived need of tenure-track librarians to publish. Several of the journals in this study had a fairly narrow focus. Examples of journals representing specialized subtopics of LIS include *The Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries* (founded in 2004), *The Journal of Map and Geography Libraries* (founded in 2004), and *The Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery and Electronic Reserves* (original title founded in 1993). The wide range of journals in our sample shows that these subject-specific journals are viable publication outlets for many librarians. Librarians have a range of publication opportunities available to them and choose to take advantage of this diversity rather than to concentrate on a few select, high-impact journals.

Of the LIS journals in which representation from Tennessee librarians was fewer than four articles each, twelve were included in the 83 journals in JCR’s most recent Social Sciences Edition (2011). Five were ranked in the top 50% of these 83 journals by 5-Year Impact Factor (see Table 5). Of the 47 journals identified in this author sample, 40 are peer-reviewed publications. Peer review status was determined by searching The Serials Directory (EBSCO) and Ulrich’s Periodical Directory (2012 edition), or the journals’ websites. When at least one of these sources listed the titles as peer-reviewed, refereed, or juried, the titles were counted as peer-reviewed publications. In this study, the peer-reviewed designation pertains to the journal itself, not necessarily to the articles in the sample that were published in that journal. Though non-substantive, non-research-based articles were excluded from the sample, it is still possible that some pieces were published in sections of the journal that are not peer-reviewed. For example, *Tennessee Libraries* contains both peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed article content.

**Limitations**

Several factors affect the development of a thorough understanding of the publication activity of academic librarians in Tennessee. The sample of publications on which this study is based includes and does not differentiate between librarians at institutions that grant faculty status to librarians and those that do not. In addition, the relative weight of research and publication activities as one of many criteria for tenure and promotion at the various institutions represented in the sample is not known. The number of librarians in the sample who may have been seeking tenure during the period under study compared with the number who had already achieved tenure is not known, and the various stages of librarians in the tenure and promotion process might have an effect on publication output. In addition, this study did not address institutional factors such as release time, writing support, professional development, and the like. This makes it difficult to draw conclusions about factors that motivate librarians to publish.

**Conclusions and Areas for Future Research**

This research contributes to the continuing conversation regarding the scholarly contributions of practicing academic librarians. It supports and compares favorably with recent studies in other areas of the country. It is reassuring that librarians in Tennessee actively contribute to the knowledge base of the profession. Approximately
one-quarter of Tennessee academic librarians, often in collaboration with others, published at least one journal article between 2007 and 2011. The majority of these authors practiced in the large research or master’s level universities in the state and worked in public or reference service, and women authors were represented in accordance with their overall numbers in the profession. Over the past twenty to thirty years, the average number of publications per author and the dominance of authors from large institutions and working in public service positions have remained approximately the same, while the proportion of female to male authors and of co-authored articles has increased significantly.

There are many areas for future research suggested by this study. This article presents evidence of productivity and authorship for Tennessee academic librarians. Additional state- and regional-level studies would provide comparisons of librarians’ scholarly output for benchmarking. Such information would be useful in identifying changing national trends in LIS scholarship. Additional research is needed to document and understand changes in the relative number of women and men contributing to the scholarly output of LIS and to the role of collaborative efforts.

Further research on what motivates librarians to publish would also be useful in understanding trends in scholarly output. How do socio-cultural factors such as racial or sexual discrimination and the underlying attitudes and beliefs that support systems of discrimination affect scholarly behaviors? What is the influence of faculty status on publication? Do librarians who need to meet requirements for tenure and/or promotion publish more articles than those who do not? Do they continue to write articles after tenure and/or promotion? What support structures can or should an institution provide to encourage faculty publication (e.g., the availability of release time, an adequate level of support staffing, and funding for professional development)? What levels of productivity might be expected of new and experienced librarians? Are there specific factors that contribute to a culture of research within an institution? Scholarly contributions to the field are important for all professions and should be an ongoing responsibility for academic librarians. Please continue the conversation.
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### TABLE 1: Publications per Author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Publications per Author</th>
<th>Number of Authors (n=115)</th>
<th>% of Authors in Study</th>
<th>Percent of Women Authors in Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2: Author Job Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number of Authors (n=115)</th>
<th>Percent of Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives/Preservation/ Special Collections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Instruction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch/Department</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation/Access</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection Development/Bibliography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Publications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Public Service</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services/Media/Internet</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3: Institutional Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>Number of Authors</th>
<th>Percent of Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Universities (very high/high research activity)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities (large)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities (medium)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges—Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Public-Rural-serving large</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Public-Rural-serving medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Schools</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4: Top Journals for Tennessee Librarian Authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Number of Articles (n= 115)</th>
<th>Percent of Articles</th>
<th>JCR’s 2011 Social Science Edition, Ranking by 5-Year Impact Factor Rank in JCR’s 2011 Social Science Edition’s Subject Category for Information Science and Library Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Libraries</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Not in subject category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Medical Library Association</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30th of 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Journal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>61st of 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Research Libraries News</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Not in subject category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Consumer Health on the Internet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Not in subject category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Not in subject category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom Line: Managing Library Finances</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Not in subject category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>5-Year Impact Factor Rank</td>
<td>In top 50% of Subject Category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Processing and Management</td>
<td>25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Documentation</td>
<td>26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portal: Libraries and the Academy</td>
<td>34&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Research Libraries</td>
<td>36&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Librarianship and Information Science</td>
<td>39&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned Publishing</td>
<td>42&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library resources and Technical Services</td>
<td>45&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Hi Tech</td>
<td>46&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-Electronic Library and Information Systems</td>
<td>50&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Services Review</td>
<td>54&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlending and Document Supply</td>
<td>57&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Journal</td>
<td>61&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Managing and maintaining space devoted to housing steadily growing physical collections has long been an issue in academic libraries. Much has been written about methods to predict, and plan for, the growth of collections over time. Yet over the last decade and a half, the focus of acquisitions has shifted from primarily print to primarily digital resources. This shift has been nearly complete for scholarly journals, and now electronic versions of monographs share, if not shelf space, collection space with their print counterparts. Due in part to this shift, we have also seen a re-thinking of the value of library space, from being viewed primarily as vital real estate for storing physical items, to spaces that can engage users and serve their needs in new ways. These changes have brought about a re-evaluation of local print collections and their importance to an individual library’s mission.

All academic libraries are navigating this territory, each with their own history and culture, budgetary concerns, collection priorities, and space limitations. The Ekstrom Library at the University of Louisville decided it would be valuable to obtain a detailed picture of the space usage in the Library’s physical collections, in order to help resolve ongoing space problems, to create a working document for ongoing space problems, to create a working document for future space planning. To this end, the Physical Collections Task Force (Task Force) was formed. The Task Force’s charge was as follows: “To determine present and future space needs for the Ekstrom Library collections; produce a written statement describing the current collections with recommendations for the future, both short and long-term outlooks.” This case study provides the background and context for our project, describes the methods used for evaluation, and reports the recommendations made based on findings.

Literature Review

Sapp and Suttle (1994, p. 156) noted that at “academic institutions across the country, library buildings constructed during 1950s and 1960s have reached their capacities, or will do so by the turn of the century.” Indeed there were several articles published in the late 1980s and early 1990s addressing space management issues. Some focused on the use of spreadsheet software as a tool (Ellis 1988), while others focused on methods of growth prediction (Wallace 1990). Some were format specific such as for journal collections (Gyeskly and Treadwell 1990), which had yet to undergo the dramatic transition to electronic formats. Sapp and Suttle explicate their methods for measuring collection expansion rates and quantifying growth capacity using a spreadsheet. Similar to the Task Force, their data was intended to be used for stack shift planning and ongoing space monitoring.

In current times, expansion of existing academic library facilities is not likely. Yet continued maintenance of spaces housing existing physical collections is still essential. Several recent case studies describe the consolidation of branch libraries and other losses of collection space that resulted in mass withdrawal projects (Thibodeau, 2010; Fong, 2010). The last several years have also seen a sharp rise in initiatives for shared retention and collection, whose goal is to enable participant libraries to reduce their own collection size, especially for low use materials (Clement, 2012). The notion that every library ought to collect and preserve everything is outdated.

Pritchard (2008) and Nitecki (2011) provide further insight into the changing context of academic library spaces. Pritchard notes in her article that the “digital environment… has transformed the passive sense of a building with books…into an environment where the user has numerous choices” (Pritchard 2008, p. 221). Nitecki expands upon the changing roles of academic libraries by describing them as “accumulator, service provider, and collaborative partner in learning and knowledge creation” (Nitecki 2011, p. 27). As libraries transition from the primary roles of “accumulator” and “service providers” to encompass collaborative roles, an evaluation of space occupied by physical collections can provide useful data to help libraries be proactive about future space planning.

After the completion of its work, the Task Force noted the recent publication of an article by Castro (2011), detailing a similar space assessment project. Castro’s article focused on the creation of two different “tools”, two spreadsheets to separately represent space availability and collection distribution. We also generated representations of space availability and collection distribution, but elected to include all data on one spreadsheet. Both created visual representations of the percent occupied space, Castro via a “heat map,” while the Task Force used a volumetric representation. One key difference was Castro’s planning for space needs for future acquisitions, which is
traditionally a fundamental aspect of stacks management. Our current budget for new materials and acquisitions trends over the last years led us to believe this was not a priority.

**Background**

The University of Louisville consists of three campuses, which house twelve colleges and schools that support 192 degree programs. According to the University’s Fact Book for 2010/2011, the student population is 22,249, which comprise 71% undergraduates, 26% graduate students, and 3% staff attending classes. The University of Louisville was ranked 111 of all universities in expenditures of federal funds for research and development in fiscal year 2012 (Lombardi et al. 2011, 34).

The University Libraries consists of five libraries: the Sidney I. Kornhauser Health Sciences Library, the Dwight Anderson Music Library, the Louis D. Brandeis School of Law Library, the William F. Ekstrom Library, and the Margaret M. Bridwell Art Library. Each library maintains its own catalog, collections and services with the Art Library and the Ekstrom Library sharing technical processing activities.

The Ekstrom Library’s main collection serves the humanities, sciences, social sciences, and business. In addition, the library is a depository for state and federal government publications. The building has a lower level and four stories above ground. The physical collections housed in the lower level of the library are the Photographic Archives and Special Collections. The Reference collection, Media collection, and the Bingham Poetry Room are housed on the first floor. The second floor houses the African-American Collection, Multicultural Children’s Collection, and Current Periodicals. Finally, the main monographic collection and the bound journals are housed on the third and fourth floors. Materials classified in the Library of Congress letters A-N are on the third floor, and the remaining materials classified in P-Z on the fourth floor. On each of the third and fourth floors, the monographs are on the south side of the floor with bound journals on the north side of the floor. When the Ekstrom Library building was completed in 1981, it comfortably held the library’s entire collection of 450,037 volumes.

By 2002, the volume count had reached 947,344, and the Ekstrom Library has since faced space management issues of its physical collections. At that time, planning began for a 50,000 square foot addition, which was completed in 2005. Most of the addition was dedicated to the enhancement of library space and services. A major feature of this space, and one of only seven in the country at the time, is the Robotic Retrieval System (RRS) occupying 8,000 square feet and capable of storing approximately 600,000 volumes. This should have alleviated space concerns for some time to come.

Three major factors, however, during the intervening years contributed to the Library’s space problems. First, and the most significant factor, was the increase in the number of books that were added to the main monographic collection. The average number of books added per year during the 1990’s was roughly 23,000-25,000. During the decade of 2000-2010, the average number of books added per year was roughly 46,000-48,000 so, that in term of shelf space, usage nearly doubled. Those were the years in which the library system was allocated a large amount of funding so that it could meet the holdings criteria in its bid for membership in the Association of Research Libraries.

Second, in 2005, the Laura Kersey Library of Engineering, Physical Science and Technology (Kersey Library) was repurposed as new classroom space for the Speed School of Engineering. This change happened on short notice with limited time to plan. Kersey Library’s 150,000 volumes, including both monographs and bound journals, were integrated into the Ekstrom Library stacks and the RRS: approximately 40% and 60% respectively. Despite the additional space obtained with the implementation of the RRS in 2006, by the year 2011, the facility housed 500,000 volumes, nearly reaching its capacity of 600,000 volumes.

The third factor that contributed to the space shortage was a long-term project to reclassify the Government Documents collection from the Superintendent of Documents (SuDocs) classification scheme to the LC classification scheme. Originally, the Government Documents collection occupied thirty-six ranges of shelving units housed on the 2nd floor. Many items were offered and de-accessioned via exchange lists. Many volumes were re-located into the RRS, but 76,086 needed to be reclassified into the stacks on the 3rd and 4th floor. Since the majority of Government Documents titles were reclassified into the LC class letters A-N, the third floor is the most crowded. The project began in 1999 and will be completed within the next two years.

The Library’s primary approach to maintaining the ever-shrinking shelf space has been to shift as needed in particularly crowded areas. In some especially compacted sections, when we found students shelving new books horizontally on the tops of other shelved books, subject specialists were asked to weed any duplicate copies of titles in those areas. This method of maintaining the stacks by “putting out fires” has persisted for the past three to four years. For instance, throughout 2011, the monthly average of shifts involved 575 shelves and 22 hours. When there is sufficient shelf space, the majority of shelving time is devoted to re-shelving books. Conversely, when there are numerous areas of compacted shelf space, the primary focus of the work becomes shifting books and relabeling ranges; work that also requires much more oversight and involvement by a supervisor. The labor-intensive efforts of multiple shifts each month provided the impetus for a critical review of the space occupied by the Library’s physical collections. The library administration responded to the situation by creating the Physical Collections Task Force.
Physical Collections Task Force

As stated in the introduction, the Task Force’s charge was as follows: “To determine present and future space needs for the Ekstrom Library collections; produce a written statement describing the current collections with recommendations for the future, both short and long-term outlooks.” In addition to the main monographic collection, this included Reference, bound periodicals, and specialized monographic sub-collections such as African American, Browsing (recently published titles), the Bingham Poetry Room, and Multicultural Children’s Literature. The Media collection, a highly circulated collection of DVDs, Kindle e-readers, iPads and laptops, was also included. Media is located in a prominent area of the library at the corner of the building where it is difficult to provide more storage and shelving; it was important to give voice to their space needs.

Task force members were recruited from the ranks of librarians and support staff from relevant units. The Task Force decided that the best approach to gather data was a comprehensive measuring and mapping of present collection space. The data gathered from the project would provide information to support future decision-making about space issues. To add further value to the report, the group decided to include data on the age of the monographic collections. Data on the average publication date of the collections would enhance the “snapshot” view of the physical collections and also assist with collection development and weeding activities.

Methodology – Available Space

The Task Force reviewed several measuring methodologies. Habich (1998, p. 4) indicates that for preliminary planning for a collection move, or when the consequences of an error are relatively small, estimates are sufficient. Habich (1998) and Self (2001) both suggest a hybrid approach, utilizing measurements and estimation, where total linear feet is extrapolated based on a certain number of sampled shelves.

The Task Force decided that precise measurement of the collection was impractical and unnecessary. However, since shelves were sampled from every column in the main monograph collection and all sub-collections, we are confident that our data would show minimal divergence from a more precise measurement. The group agreed that we would not consider volumes that were circulating or missing, based on an assumption that the number of volumes represented, particularly over the summer months when the majority of measuring took place, would be insignificant for our purposes.

The Stacks Maintenance supervisor organized and led student assistants in measuring the main monographic collection. As a starting point, a digital representation of the stacks was created using existing architectural floor plans. Using Microsoft Publisher, locations of all shelving units and other relevant architectural features, such as sporadic cement pillars were overlaid onto the digital blueprints (see Appendix A).

In conjunction with the floor plans, a log was created for recording measurements, which were done by hand. Each range of shelving was coded, beginning with the first range to be measured labeled A. “A1” indicated row A, side 1. “A1-1” was the first column in row A, side 1; “A1-2” the next adjacent column, etc. For purposes of the study, a column was defined as a single side of a double-sided shelving unit, typically 6-7 shelves. Students were instructed to sample several shelves in each column, and measure in inches the empty space at the end of each of those shelves. Once they obtained an average for the sample shelves, that figure was multiplied by the actual number of shelves in that column and recorded in the corresponding location listed on the log. This method determined the amount of free space in a particular column. Student assistants were instructed to work on the measuring project when the backlog of un-shelved books in their assigned section fell below a certain level. At this rate, it took five months to complete measurements for the 88,053 linear feet (16.67 miles) of shelving in the monographic collections. The monographic sub-collections, such as the African American collection, Bingham Poetry Room, etc. were measured in the same manner.

For the main monograph collection, the data gathered was transferred to a specially prepared spreadsheet that included the mapping of LC classifications across all shelves. This mapping allowed us to calculate the number of shelves per classification, as well as the percent of total shelving that number represented. Together with the data from the space available measurements, this spreadsheet provided an easy way to visualize the size and location of the most compacted areas in the collection, and their relation to the scope of the collection as a whole. See a segment of the data in appendix D. For each sub-collection, such as the African-American and Bingham Poetry Room collection, a separate bar chart was created which summarizes the percentage of space usage but does not include analysis by classification. See the chart in appendix C.

Bound journals, shelved on the third and fourth floors along the same classification division as the main monograph collection, were measured by the Serials Librarian. Using the same digital representation of the stacks, and depending upon the Librarian’s visual assessment of the degree of compaction, either the empty space or the occupied space measured to calculate total available space. For instance, for the bound journals on the third floor, the shelves were quite full so the empty space was measured. Conversely, for the bound journals on the fourth floor, many of the shelves were empty so the occupied space was measured.

Methodology – Age

Part of the Task Force’s charge was to “produce a written statement describing the collections”. Though our primary focus was on space-related issues, we were interested in determining the age of the collection to add another dimension to the collection description and to provide
potentially useful data for Collection Development. Using Microsoft Access, the University Libraries Voyager Integrated Library System was queried to provide a report based on call number and the publication date, the first date in the 008 field in the MARC record. A report was run for the main monograph collection and for each of the selected sub-collections. Data on the age of the bound journals collection was not included as it was deemed irrelevant due to their continuing nature.

The reports showed that publication dates for the main monograph collection spanned from 1560 to 2011. We elected to eliminate the 578 titles with publication dates from 1560 to 1833 in order to make calculations of the mean publication date more meaningful. This span of 273 years accounted for only .08% of the collection overall. The remaining publication dates, from 1834 to 2011, represents 99.92% of the collection and provides a more accurate view of the true age of the collection.

The report data, which included the classification number, publication date, and number of books per classification per year, was exported directly into a spreadsheet. The standard formula for obtaining an average was used to calculate the age of the collection as a whole and by each classification letter. In other words, the number of items for each publication date was multiplied by the date in order to obtain a “total number of years.” The sum of those calculations was divided by the total number of items. A sample chart created from this data shows the number of volumes and average publication date by classification. For this chart, classifications were consolidated by letter into twenty ranges, providing an overview of the age of the collection as a whole. Detailed breakdowns by all individual classifications were retained in spreadsheets for more granular analysis as needed. See the chart in appendix D.

The average publication dates for books in the sub-collections were calculated by the same process used for the main collection. Since the sub-collections are smaller than the general monograph collection, there were fewer publication dates to calculate so all dates were included in the calculation of the mean publication date.

Findings – Space

The Task Force used 75% full as its standard for manageable shelf capacity. Leighton (1999, p. 183) notes that as much as 86% capacity is manageable. He suggests however, that shelves with over 86% full require frequent shifts, which require more resources than simply shelving. The Task Force chose a more conservative standard for shelf capacity so that problem areas could be seen and remedial action taken sooner. Allowing for a margin of error in the measurements was also a consideration.

The data obtained from shelf space measurements in the main monograph collection indicated a “healthier” collection in terms of space than we originally assumed based on observation. See the graph in appendix E. This came as a surprise based on the very real space problems faced on a daily basis by stacks maintenance. A closer look revealed some significant disparities between the third and fourth floor, across which the Library's main monograph collection is distributed. Shelves on the third floor were 79% full, with twenty call number sections filled to 85% capacity or more. On the other hand, the monograph collection on the fourth floor is only 72% full, with ten call number sections filled over 85%. Moreover, the most compacted classifications are often located contiguously, which makes shifting extremely difficult. When considered as a whole, the general stacks collection is filled to a generally healthy 76%, however the third floor is precariously compacted and inconsistently distributed, which will need to be addressed before this largest portion of the monograph collection becomes unmanageable.

Among the sub-collections, only the Bingham Poetry Collection, at 82% full, needed immediate attention in order for the collection to remain manageable. All other sub-collections are generally reported to have either low acquisition rates, such as the Multicultural Children's Literature collection, at 78% full, or contain books that are regularly transferred to the stacks, such as the Browsing Collection, which is 68% full. This type of data allows for shifting triage versus all-collection shifting.

Overall, bound journals have plenty of shelf space, although this is primarily due to one very large contiguous section of empty shelving on the 4th floor. The third floor is almost shelved to 90% capacity, and the fourth floor is shelved to only 44% capacity.

Findings – Age

Based on 99.92% of the collection, the data shows the average publication date for the main monograph collection to be 1975. See appendix F for a chart of the number of volumes by publication date. We were able to identify the LC classification, that of A-AZ, General Works, which has oldest average publication date of 1962. In the past, when there was plenty of shelf space, the Reference Department often transferred older volumes to the stacks rather than weeding them. Other subject areas with older than average publication dates are Literature, P-PZ, and World History, D-DU, each with average publication dates of 1969. Although in Literature and World History, an average publication date over forty years old is less of a concern than in subject areas that are best served with more current material. For instance, in Science with the classification letters Q-QZ, the average publication date is 1985. The subject area with the latest average publication date is Military Science, U-UH, which has an average publication date of 1994. Reviewing the number of items in each publication date, we note that collection growth peaked in 2000, and there has been a steady decline in new, current year print acquisitions over the past five years.

The average publication date for our main collection may be in keeping with comparable academic libraries. Anecdotally, however, the collection as a whole appears dated. More monographs are being purchased in electronic format than in print, and many lively discussions have
ensued about whether we are hastening the demise of our print collection, as it is neither extensively weeded nor refreshed with sufficient new materials. The browsing collection, for example, which consists of recently published fiction and non-fiction, circulates (and in hand, goes missing) at a very high rate.

Recommendations

A primary goal of the Task Force was to make concrete, prioritized recommendations that could be enacted as soon as possible in order to remedy the most immediate space problems. In the near future, the Task Force recommended an extensive weeding project be conducted in the main monograph collection on the third floor using criteria to be developed in consultation with the Head of Collection Development. A weeding project would create shelf space throughout the collection making room on the shelves for shifting in the compacted areas. A subsequent weeding project using the same criteria in the RRS would be a logical activity to create more room in that facility. All books that are withdrawn from the collection would be sent to a book resale agency.

Recommendations made for the Media Resources collection, such as a need for powered, metal laptop shelves and lockable storage, highlight its uniqueness.

The Task Force determined that a sub-collection that needed immediate attention was the Bingham Poetry Room at 82% capacity. The collection houses poetry titles from North American and Great Britain, and the Task Force recommended that the collection contain only North American titles. The change would decrease the density of the collection from 82% to 73% full. Relocating the British poetry titles to the third floor would increase the “PR’s” in the general stacks from 71.5% filled to 72.4% filled. The Reference Department contacted several faculty members of the English department whose specialty is American and British poetry. When presented with the recommendation, the faculty members were opposed to the idea and offered the compromise of transferring all pre-nineteenth century of both American and British poetry titles to the stacks.

No immediate recommendations were made for the bound journal collection. We continue to shift our journal collection to electronic only versions where possible, and bind less with each passing year.

The Task Force also recommended that the same study be repeated in several years, so that the current “snapshot” of the collections can be compared to the latest data. The comparative data will measure the Library’s success in achieving better distribution of its physical collections, which in turn provides easier maintenance for staff and, most importantly, better access for the Library’s patrons.

Recommendations Enacted and Conclusion

The Task Force report provided data which has enabled us to remedy urgent space problems and has become a working document used for continued maintenance for our physical collections. For example, the Reference Department is weeding or relocating items in its collection so that only frequently used material will be housed near the reference desk on the first floor. Currently, there are sixteen shelves of ready-reference volumes behind the reference desk. Nearby, there are eighteen ranges of reference books that are used less often. The final goal is to reduce the reference collection from eighteen ranges of books to nine ranges, so that more study tables can be placed in the reference area. As subject specialists review the collection, data on available space in the general stacks allows them to factor available space as part of their decision-making process, whether to retain, relocate or withdraw a title. Two empty shelves resulting from this project were designated to be installed on the third floor at the end of an existing range (G-HD, which ranged from 80-94% capacity).

The Collection Development Department, in response to both the shelf capacity data and the age of the main monographic collection, accepted the Task Force’s recommendation that a weeding project be undertaken. The subject specialists work from a report produced from the Voyager ILS that identifies duplicate copies that have a publication date of 1999 or earlier. Working in the stacks from this list, subject specialists quickly evaluate the duplicates for content, condition, and any information available on due slips about the items’ circulation histories. Although this is a fairly conservative weeding project, it has resulted thus far in approximately 15,000 copies withdrawn, and therefore small amounts of shelf space regained throughout the collection. Any greater rate of withdrawal would be difficult for Technical Services to process, and any “deeper,” more thorough weeding project would require much more time on the part of subject specialists. The path chosen is manageable and will result in more “ease” in the collection overall.

With highly compacted problem areas clearly identified in the context of adjacent areas, multiple shifting projects will be planned in advance and prioritized rather than “putting out fires.” As Appendix G shows, there is quite a bit of variation in age between classifications. Data obtained on the age of individual classifications could enable more expedient weeding in certain areas where age and lack of space overlap. Because we had a high degree of duplication of titles, Collection Development Department elected to begin weeding by identifying and withdrawing those.

Finally, the Task Force report provides data for the Library administration to use in support of future space planning. Currently, the Ekstrom Library houses several collaborative partners all of which support the University of Louisville’s educational mission -- the Writing Center, the Delphi Center for Teaching and Learning, the Braden Institute for Social Justice, Muhammad Ali Institute for Peace and Justice, and “REACH,” the University’s tutoring center. As the balance of collections tips more heavily towards the digital and collaborative partnerships with other University organizations continues to expand, the eventual reallocation of some library space may not be a question of “if,” but
rather “when.” In preparation for such shifts, the Task Force’s report should provide useful baseline information.

Academic libraries are in a time of great transition, encompassing changes in the nature of users’ needs and expectations, in the formats of our collections, in the tools that we use to discover those collections, and finally, in the way we view the Library as space. How can the Library best provide resources and services that balance our users’ multiple needs – for individual and/or collaborative research and for access to all types of information – print, digital and visual? Latimer (2011, p.131) observed that “the move from collections in the traditional sense to connections in our multidisciplinary, collaborative, user-centered library world will continue to provide the challenge for the foreseeable future.” The authors have provided an example of how an analysis of space allocated to physical collections is an integral part of managing this ongoing transition.
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Appendix A - Ekstrom Library 3rd floor stacks
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Appendix B  
Segment of 3rd Floor – By Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>% Filled</th>
<th>% Empty</th>
<th># of Shelves</th>
<th>% of Total Shelving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>2597</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1246</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-GE</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF-GN</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GV</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C  
Ekstrom Subcollections Shelving Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>% Empty</th>
<th>% Filled</th>
<th># of Shelves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Literature</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham Poetry</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browsing Collection</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Children's Literature</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Collection</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75% = "Ideal Volume"
Appendix E – Monographic Shelving Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Filled</th>
<th>% Empty</th>
<th># Shelves</th>
<th>% Total Shelving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17,334</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10,665</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27,989</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75% = “Ideal volume”
Appendix F

Ekstrom Stacks
Number of Volumes by Publication Dates and Classification Groups
Starting From Scratch: Implementing a Successful, Multifaceted Information Literacy Program for the First-Year Course
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Introduction

Roughly 70 percent of all colleges and universities in the United States have a first-year program of some sort incorporated into the undergraduate curriculum, aimed at improving retention (Graves & Pierard, 2002). First-year programs have a long history of collaboration with libraries in college and university settings. The goals of these programs often include the promotion of information literacy skills in order to better prepare freshmen for future information-seeking needs as they progress through the stages of their academic careers. These collaborations often involve students visiting the library via the first-year program course, which may be referred to as Freshman Seminar, the First-Year Experience, University Studies, etc.

Although students do not typically encounter bibliographic instruction until a point of need (i.e. freshman composition courses), research supports the idea that students benefit all the more from “just in case” instruction presented during introductory freshman courses (Dabbour, 1997). These visits or orientations take place in a variety of formats including physical library tours, workshops led by a librarian in a classroom, or an online module with a virtual tutorial or orientation that can be accessed remotely. Regardless of the format, librarians and first-year program administrators often struggle with the challenge of having the resources to build a successful collaboration that is effective and meaningful for students without compromising valuable class time and other course-related programming. Additionally, achieving buy-in from administrators and program coordinators is not always easy due to the severe time limitations and the perceived burden placed on limited resources.

In many instances, the first-year experience course is worth a single, one-hour credit. Many academic librarians are accustomed to the reality that they may only be allotted fifty minutes to provide instruction on everything that a freshman student will need to know to be successful in his/her first year research endeavors, not to mention the lack of time to assess the effectiveness of the instruction. Online learning resources such as free-standing tutorials and audio and video podcasts have opened new asynchronous avenues for teaching information literacy skills, but used alone they can also create disconnect between new students and their physical orientation with library collections and services. A combination of both virtual and physical instruction can provide an optimal learning environment for promoting information literacy skills to freshmen, while also providing opportunities for librarians to determine learning outcomes and teach to multiple learning styles using a variety of activities.

This study describes a program created from scratch in which collaboration is initiated by librarians with teaching faculty in the first-year program to provide information literacy skills to incoming freshmen. The program is not only successful logistically, but is designed with assessment needs and evidence of student learning in mind. Additionally, the program design takes into account the needs of learners through utilization of a variety of learning activities and teaching tools that include group interaction, web-based tutorials, individual assignments, and peer-learning.

Background

The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, located in Southeastern North Carolina, is a four-year member institution of The University of North Carolina 16-campus system. Total enrollment for the university is over 6000 students, including 700 graduate students. The university is a regional institution serving largely the eight surrounding counties of this area of the state.

For more than ten years the Mary Livermore Library has collaborated with the university’s Freshman Seminar program, a first-year program on campus designed to enhance the academic and social integration of freshmen into college. Freshman Seminar at UNCP is a required, one-credit hour bearing general education course that provides students the opportunity to learn various study skills and time management, as well as gain familiarity with the college classroom and campus, while becoming engaged in social and community activities.

The library’s role in this collaboration has been historically pedestrian, with the focus on orienting freshmen to the physical premises of the library and less on promoting information literacy skills. Freshman Seminar instructors were encouraged, not required, to bring their sections to the library for one class period during the fall semester for a fifty-minute guided tour of the building. Students were presented with a general overview of the physical premises including collection areas such as reference and serials, the circulation desk, and an introduction to basic library policies and services such as course reserves, printing, interlibrary loan, etc.

Roughly fifty sections of Freshman Seminar are typically taught each fall, with slightly more or less than half of the sections making their way to the library for the tour. This
has left many entering students without any exposure to information literacy or in-depth knowledge of library resources available to them. Overall, the academic emphasis in the library portion of the Freshman Seminar course was largely insufficient for providing any meaningful orientation to finding information, using electronic information tools, and critically evaluating Internet sources for academic content. Not only was the library tour method unproductive and unappealing to students, but the instruction librarians felt that they were not doing all that could be done to support the mission of the university in terms of student learning outcomes.

As the coordinator of instructional services, the author proceeded to restructure the library orientation for the Freshman Seminar course to make it more meaningful for students, seeking to incorporate target information literacy objectives, while actively engaging students in the learning process of finding and using information within the context of academic research. Significant considerations made in the planning process involved examining the best methods of delivery of instruction, deciding on the format of the instructional content based on pre-determined learning objectives, choosing the most effective and practical methods of assessment, accommodating a variety of learning styles, and preparing non-instruction librarians for teaching in the classroom.

**Literature Review**

Academic librarians have been providing bibliographic sessions, tours, and orientations to students since the 1800s, but it wasn’t until the growing complexity of libraries and information resources in the 1970s created a need for a shift toward more sophisticated methods of teaching students how to use information effectively (Guskin, 2007). More recently, academic libraries have been aspiring to collaborate with first-year programs on campuses in efforts to engage new students and to promote information literacy skills for the 21st century. Thomas G. Kirk, Jr. (2007) states that the collaboration between classroom faculty and librarians is essential to success in first-year programs and that classroom faculty should have a good knowledge of how the research process is conducted and what types of resources are available to students so that they will be prepared to complete course assignments successfully.

There is an abundance of literature regarding the redesign or creation of information literacy collaborations with first-year programs at institutions of higher learning. In redesigning the Freshman Seminar library orientation the author was interested in researching the types of collaborations that existed between libraries and first-year programs, as well as best practices in promoting information literacy achievement outcomes for freshmen students. The following review includes brief descriptions of such programs.

Dabbour (1997) describes how an experimental Freshman Seminar course was created employing active learning library instruction as opposed to traditional lecture or demonstration. In this study, librarians created an alternative to the traditional ‘one-shot’ library instruction lecture by incorporating active learning exercises into the sessions.

The University of Tennessee’s first-year program has recently evolved to incorporate a library module created by librarians, which addresses learning objectives, learning outcomes, and corresponding learning activities with targeted assessment (Bullard, Sharp, Bright & Grey, 2007).

Librarians at Washington State University initiated collaboration with Freshman Seminar to provide information literacy instruction which tied its objectives to five information literacy standards developed by The Association of College and Research Libraries (Lindsay, 2003).

Parang, Raine, & Stevenson (2000) described how Pepperdine University revamped its information literacy collaboration with Freshman Seminar classes by incorporating hands-on learning, accommodation of multiple learning styles, and web-based tours and tutorials.

In regards to assessment of such collaborations, many studies featured the use of pre- and post-tests to gauge knowledge acquisition following the re-design of instruction (Knight, 2002; Carter, 2002; Mosby & Sugarman, 2002). At Pepperdine, Freshman Seminar students were asked to complete a six-question quiz based on measurable outcomes (Parang, Raine, & Stevenson, 2000). The evaluation was administered to a group of three classes that had completed both online information literacy modules and attended a face-to-face instruction session.

Because first-year seminar courses vary in range from one credit hour to as many as three, there are different evaluation techniques that have been used by librarians depending on course format, assignment requirements, and learning objectives. For example, at Washington State University, librarians implemented a citation analysis evaluation tool in its two-credit Freshman Seminar course in order to measure the quality of sources students used in their final group project – a multi-media, web-based presentation (Johnson, Lindsay, & Ursin, 2004).

In this study, the focus was on using the principles of active learning because they can be geared toward engaging students and promoting deeper understanding of information literacy skills. According to a seminal paper on active learning co-authored by Bonwell and Eison (1991), students preferred learning environments where active learning is employed over traditional lecture. In active learning environments, students gain a far better understanding of the material when they are able to play a role in participating in the shaping of content, instead of simply having it dictated to them using one-way communication (Leonard, 2002).

Based on this pedagogy, it made sense to include activities that involved collaboration and the opportunity for students to become engaged in differing perspectives of the learning content. Design of program exercises based on active
learning strategies allows students to become acquainted with both the physical library building and how to use electronic information resources in a way that accommodates a multitude of learning styles while also giving students an opportunity to experience research in different settings – individual, group, face-to-face, and web-based. The following section describes a study on how librarians at UNC-Pembroke were able to develop a mix of traditional information literacy classroom instruction with active learning collaborations and self-paced online learning activities to create a robust, first-year program based on learning objectives.

Case Study

The Freshman Seminar course at UNCP is a one-credit hour course that lasts eleven weeks. Due to classroom time constraints faced by Freshman Seminar instructors, the author acknowledged that there would be instructors who would not be willing or able to devote two whole class meetings to face-to-face library instruction. Despite this acknowledgement, it was decided to propose the new information literacy program to Freshman Seminar administrators, asking to speak directly with instructors in order to stress the importance of the program’s objectives for student success, and to gauge interest level.

The goal of presenting the program directly to the faculty was to try to get as many instructors to participate in the hopes that momentum would build within the university community for providing all incoming students with the same baseline of information literacy skills during their first college semester.

A presentation was made to the Center for Academic Excellence (CAE), the overseeing administrative unit for first-year programs, and Freshman Seminar instructors at an annual meeting. The presentation described the provision of two, fifty-minute instructional sessions that would also incorporate student completion of out-of-class assignments and an online learning outcomes assessment. This presentation was viewed favorably by faculty for three reasons: They could see the value that the out-of-class components would add to the quality of the program; they liked the idea of an outcomes assessment that would provide evidence of the effectiveness of the instruction; and they appreciated the addition of online learning content that enabled them to spare valuable class time. By adding an out-of-class element, assessment data could be collected through the use of an online pre-test and post-test and three individual assignments that were to be completed and turned into the Freshman Seminar instructor. These assessments were put in place in order for librarians to be able to address learning objectives adapted from the Association of College & Research Libraries’ (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards One through Three. Table 1 shows the targeted outcomes for the students completing this program.

Instruction Session One

The first fifty-minute session consists of a lecture-based demonstration and hands-on experience using the library’s online catalog and one electronic article database, followed by discussion of the evaluation of Internet websites for academic use. The goal of the first part of the session is to teach primarily to the learning outcomes found in Standard One of the ACRL’s Information Literacy Competency Standards. These outcomes rely heavily on skills relating to defining the information need, including: Becoming familiar with information resource types, developing a topic, and exploring key concepts and terms upon which to begin building a search strategy.

Discussion at the beginning of the session includes distinguishing the differences between resources such as books, reference books, periodical articles and websites, including the tools used for locating each (ten minutes). Students are also asked to describe previous academic research and writing experiences with classmates, and are encouraged to think about the importance of having information related skills.

During the second segment of the session, outcomes from Standards Two and Three of the ACRL standards are addressed, with students working toward developing successful search strategies and thinking critically about how to begin evaluating the quality of information sources.

Students are given a theoretical research topic and asked to generate a meaningful list of keywords to provide a base for searching different resources (five minutes). Demonstrations for using library resources include searching the online catalog by title, author, and keyword. Additional modeling is administered on learning the various limiting and sorting features (five minutes). Next, students are introduced to electronic periodical article databases including a demonstration of Boolean operator implementation using the keyword list generated during the earlier class discussion (ten minutes).

At this point, students are given an opportunity to apply these concepts through a hands-on learning activity by which they work through a variety of searches and record information based on theoretical research topics. Many of these exercises can be directly tied to Standard One and Two by which students are learning to explore different avenues for finding information and learning how to develop a topic and related search strategies (fifteen minutes).

To conclude the first session, a discussion is facilitated to get students thinking about critically evaluating the content of information found on the Web – the main cornerstone of ACRL Standard Three (five minutes). Students are asked to identify the different characteristics of top-level domains. They are also shown a list of results retrieved from performing a search in Google based on an academic research topic. Upon viewing several of the first sites on the list, students contribute observations regarding
evaluation criteria such as authoritativeness, objectivity, relevance, and currency.

Out of Class Assignments

Following the first session, students are instructed to complete a series of supplemental assignments outside of class before returning for the second session one week later. The purpose of the assignments is to allow students to apply skills and concepts learned during the first session and to introduce new concepts that were either lightly brushed on or not at all. Each student is given a slip of paper with instructions on how to access the assignments from a Blackboard site developed by librarians.

The first assignment asks students to view a web-based video tour of the library. The tour is a series of videos that can be completed at the students’ own pace. The purpose of this activity is to acquaint freshmen with a visual and audio orientation to the library’s collections and service areas in lieu of participating in a time-consuming physical tour of the building. In order to assess completion of the activity, a short, ten-question quiz is linked to the web tour which students print out and return to the librarian at the second instruction session. Quizzes were checked for general understanding, but were not formally graded.

The second assignment is geared toward providing students with a fundamental understanding of the differences between scholarly and popular periodicals, utilizing both print and electronic publications – this activity serves to reinforce some components of Standard Three which was briefly introduced during the first instruction session. Upon downloading and studying a chart that describes the differentiating characteristics of several types of serial publications, students complete a written assignment consisting of four questions that require each to come to the library and work individually. The questions are specifically designed to have students locate articles on popular disciplines and examine them carefully in order to record information relating to the intended outcome.

The third assignment requires students to read a document that lists and describes five criteria for evaluating web pages, again addressing evaluative competencies found in Standard Three. Using the evaluation criteria, each student is asked to complete a worksheet whereby they locate several examples of both ‘good’ and ‘bad’ websites pertaining to guided research topics. They are then required to answer several questions about each page in the context of the criteria that are used to justify their decisions. At the end, students are asked to reflect on the exercise and its importance to becoming good consumers of information.

Instruction Session Two

The second fifty-minute session occurs exactly one week after the first session. This gives the students a week to complete the three assignments and allows them the opportunity to ask for assistance from librarians and their Freshman Seminar instructors outside of class. Upon returning for the second session, the assignments are quickly collected by librarians at the beginning of class. While the assignments are not graded by the instructors in most cases, they are reviewed by librarians to help gauge the effectiveness of the instruction.

This second session is devoted to active learning in the form of collaborative work and peer-learning, with little facilitation by the librarian. At the beginning of the session, the students are grouped into teams of three or four and given a worksheet to complete. Using what they have learned during the first instruction session and through completion of the individual out-of-class assignments, they are directed to find several resources in a variety of formats based on different research topics and to record their findings. Known as the Information Investigation, the activity requires each group to use theoretical research topics to find reference books, scholarly journals in print, electronic articles in a database, and websites on the Internet. This activity is essentially putting together everything students have learned over the course of the first session and assignments into a collaborative peer-learning experience. Within their groups, students are encouraged to work together in finding each resource and to use a reference librarian for help if assistance is needed.

Students are allowed most of the period to work together to collect their resources before being called back to the classroom. Upon their return, the librarian uses the remainder of the time to designate a leader from each group who will present the group’s findings. This peer-demonstration is conducted at the front of the class using a SmartBoard projection system that students can manipulate to show how they went about locating items in the catalog, database, and Internet. Feedback from classmates is encouraged during the demonstration period. Following the demonstrations, the librarian closes the session by fielding remaining questions about any content covered throughout the course of the program to reinforce learning and alleviate any remaining confusion or misconceptions.

Results

The program was officially implemented during the fall semester, by which instructors were encouraged to participate by bringing their students to the library twice, as opposed to the traditional ‘one-shot’ library tour. Librarians were encouraged by the willingness of many instructors to adopt the new information literacy program, although instructors were still given the option of participating in the tour. Nearly half of all participating Freshman Seminar instructors opted for the new information literacy program, while roughly half requested the traditional one-session tour – a few chose to participate in neither offering.

Of those who participated in the new program, most agreed to the requests made of them to participate in the assessment aspect of the program as well. The assessment was to include the collection of the three outside-of-class assignments (virtual tour quiz, scholarly vs. popular, evaluating web pages) and completion of a web-based pre-test and post-test.
Historically, assessment of library instruction was strictly concerned with output data such as number of sessions taught and head count, however more recent trends are aimed at determining learning outcomes (Knight, 2002). According to Barclay (1993), there are essentially four varieties of bibliographic instruction assessments that are commonly used in academic libraries including anecdote, survey, test, and evidence of use. These types of assessments can be used to gauge student learning, effectiveness of instruction, but also affective learning which often involves measuring students’ perceptions, awareness, and attitudes toward learning. Anecdotes and surveys rarely offer hard evaluative data of student learning outcomes, while tests and evidence of use are most often used to demonstrate acquisition of knowledge (Carter, 2002).

In this study we relied on both anecdotal and test data. The collection of out-of-class assignments was used as a means of getting students to apply knowledge they had learned in the first instruction session. The assignments were collected but not graded by librarians, thus they were merely used to get a general feel of the level of knowledge attainment that students had acquired during the first session.

Overall, the number of assignments turned in was low, with only half of session one attendees turning them in, most likely because students knew they would not be receiving a grade unless explicitly stated by their course instructor. For this reason, the data collected from the assignments played a minimal factor in determining the success of learning objective achievement; however it did provide the library with feedback on how much emphasis had been placed on the completion of the assignments by course instructors. It also provided us with anecdotal data on which questions posed larger difficulty for students as well as how well the assignment was understood. Generally, for those that turned them in, students performed well and completed the tasks posed in assignment two relating to scholarly vs. popular distinction. Students fared less well in being able to evaluate websites dealing with climate change in assignment three. We found that quite often, little justification was given on why they felt a particular site was authoritative or not. More attention needs to be paid to this critical skill in the future.

Quantitative assessment of student learning is of keen significance for determining the success of the program as well as providing insight for future modifications. The assessment tool used to collect quantitative data was created in the form of an online multiple choice pre-test that was administered to each student prior to the first instruction session. A corresponding post-test was conducted after the second session. Each test consists of twenty questions that are designed to reflect learning objectives derived from the ACRL standards mentioned earlier. See Appendix 1 and 2 for pre-test and post-test questions.

While the questions on each exam are not identical, they are mirrored to test the same competencies using slightly different examples. By changing the text of the questions for each test and randomizing their display, we were able to prevent cheating that may have skewed the results. There are eleven questions that address ACRL Standard Two: The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently. There are six questions that address Standard One: The information literate student determines the nature and extent of the information needed. And the remaining three questions address Standard Three: The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically.

The course instructor provided students with a link to each test and may or may not have provided participation credit to students who completed them. That decision was left to the discretion of the instructor. In our study, a significant sample of 77 students completed both the pre-test and post-test, with the results described below.

Overall, the average increase in score from the pre-test to the post-test proved to be dramatic. Out of the 77 students that had completed both tests, the mean pre-test score was 47 percent and the mean post-test score was 71 percent – an increase of 24 points. In only nine instances did an individual’s post-test score not improve when matched up with his pre-test score.

In the context of learning outcomes, students fared the best in learning the outcomes from Standards Two and Three. Overall, they demonstrated a 32% gain in test scores for questions addressing the second standard, and a 38% gain in questions addressing the third standard. For questions relating to Standard One, only a 5% gain was achieved.

The lack of achievement in Standard One indicates that there was not enough time allocated to discussing information types. For example, student scores declined for the post-test question dealing with the purpose of reference books (Question 4). Students were also confused about how to develop a topic (Question 16, Post-test). Only one question during the first instruction session assignment related to developing a topic, and the out-of-class assignments were mostly geared toward proficiency in Standards Two and Three. In the future, more emphasis should be paid to outcomes in Standard One in order set a good foundation for building skills related to developing topics and surveying different information sources.

In Standard Two outcomes, students achieved increases of 25% or more on seven of eleven questions asked. Students showed particularly strong gains in learning how to properly identify parts of a citation. They also proved to be adept at learning how to develop an initial search strategy with Boolean operators (Questions 10, 16, Pre-test). Only one of the questions in Standard Two saw a decline in post-test scores (Question 11). Interestingly, this question related to revising a search strategy to get better results. While we did briefly address this competency in the first instruction, these results tell us that more time is needed to be spent working on adjusting search strategies when the initial search does not yield acceptable results.
Standard Three outcomes were given less emphasis on the pre-test and post-test, although a good deal of content on the out-of-class assignments addressed these competencies. Of the three questions on the tests relating to Standard Three, each saw an increase in student performance. The largest gain was on a question dealing with characteristics of scholarly vs. popular periodicals (Question 12, Pre-test). Students initially performed poorly on the pre-test when answering this question (26%), but showed vast improvements on the post-test (95%) for a gain of nearly 70 percent. This gain is attributed to the emphasis that was placed on this topic in the out-of-class assignments by which students were asked to locate and examine scholarly articles in the print periodicals area of the library.

Overall we felt the results of the testing were very positive, as there were only four questions on the post-test where students had performed more poorly than they had on the pre-test. The most significant signs of improvement of information literacy seemed to come in areas relating to identifying citations and devising search strategies.

A possible correlation may exist between positive student achievement on the post-test and whether or not they completed the out-of-class assignments. A sample of the twelve lowest scores on the post-test (55 percent or lower) and the twelve highest scores (85 percent or better) were matched with the assignments collected for those 24 participants. Of the twelve students scoring 55 percent or lower, only three had turned in both out-of-class assignments. Eight of the twelve students scoring 85 percent or better had turned in both assignments. Although the data points to a trend that shows that students who completed the assignments scored better on the post-test, it is important to note that there were no assignments collected from the top three scorers on the post-test. This may mean that success is not dependent upon completing the assignments, or that there are inconsistencies on the part of faculty when collecting the assignments from students.

**Conclusion and Future Direction**

**Strengths**

The program clearly represents potential for developing an effective information literacy collaboration with the first-year program. The test scores of students who had participated in both sessions and completed the assigned work in between the sessions fared the best. The overall design of the program fit nicely within the allotted time of instruction, although the necessity for more face-to-face instruction will always exist. The addition of out-of-class assignments provided an easy-to-access delivery mechanism for building in supplemental practice that saved valuable class time.

The model we created for addressing learning outcomes through instructor guided discussions and activities during the initial instruction session gave students a solid foundation by which to begin thinking about information literacy concepts and how to address research projects. The out-of-class assignments provided useful opportunities for individuals to apply this knowledge toward practicing individual skills and competencies in a research-oriented activity. Completing the activities gave students a sense of a simulated research environment without experiencing the stress of receiving a major grade and dealing with strict deadlines.

The peer-learning activity which comprised of most of the second instruction session was highly engaging for students and gave them an opportunity to collaborate and learn from one another. This activity allowed students to share previous research experience while exploring a new learning environment and the unfamiliar resources contained within it. We believe this activity helped to allay fears and anxiety commonly associated with freshmen student research experiences, providing a positive first experience in the college library environment.

The out-of-class assignments themselves were carefully planned out to match targeted learning objectives and seemed to be an effective method of addressing competencies that would have otherwise been neglected due to lack of face-to-face instruction time. The same can be said for the provision of the pre-test and post-test in a convenient online format by which students could access at a time of their choosing. The ability to quickly retrieve and export results into a spreadsheet from web form also made assessment data more accessible to librarians and instructors that may have requested it.

Based on the results of the post-test data, this study can be seen as an effective model for implementing an information literacy program in conjunction with the first-year course, particularly in courses that are awarded less than three credit hours or have a limited allotment of time for library instruction. Despite its initial success however, there are several challenges to be addressed in strengthening the program as it moves forward.

**Challenges**

A critical element to having a successful program is to achieve buy-in from faculty members that teach sections of the first-year program course. Under ideal conditions, all FRS course instructors would be required to participate in the program. Because only half of the sections of Freshman Seminar participated in the program, the program is only effectively reaching half of our freshmen students – we’re still leaving a great percentage of our incoming students with only the research skills they bring with them from high school. Based on the pre-test data we acquired through the first semester, many of these students will be poorly prepared to take on college level research projects. Demonstrating the effectiveness and value to instructors who opted for the traditional tour or no instruction at all is a challenge to be addressed in future iterations.

The importance of marketing and presenting a clear case for the need for information literacy skills is paramount to any program’s success. Faculty need to be educated and ‘sold’ on the benefits of student achievement of information literacy skills during the first year and how that
impacts academic matriculation. A program with sound design and successful execution is of little use if instructors do not see the value of the potential outcome. Therefore, achievement on a large scale is dependent on librarians’ ability to get the optimal number of instructors and students to participate.

Faculty commitment to making the program effective must also be stronger among those who volunteered to participate in the program. It is not enough to simply ask students to attend the sessions and complete the assignments, rather further incorporation of the competencies into the course content would help to make more relevant the learning objectives and put them into a larger context.

For many instructors, it was a difficult transition from participating in the traditional library tour which only required one class period, to participating in two instruction sessions with out-of-class components and assessments. Completion of the out-of-class assignments was lower than expected, as was the number of participants who had completed both the pre-test and post-test. This issue is difficult to address because the librarian is not the gatekeeper of the course. Enforcement of assignment completion is predicated on willingness of the instructor to promote enthusiasm for the program and possibly assign grades to completed work. Perhaps this will improve as the program is more actively marketed, word of mouth spreads, and instructors begin to plan for participating in these sessions in advance during their pre-semester preparations.

Future Considerations

Almost every Freshman Seminar instructor at UNC-Pembroke sees the value in promoting information literacy skills to incoming students. But to what degree do they place that value in the context of other course content that needs to be covered? The major initiative moving forward with the program is to demonstrate value to instructors in order to increase participation. Librarians need to play a more active role in the program by attending departmental meetings and working to collaborate with Freshman Seminar instructors on developing research assignments that could be incorporated into the curriculum.

We must also find more streamlined methods of creating learning modules that might be able to replace in-class instruction. These modules could be used to both increase the level of participation and the collection of important assessment data. By making these processes easier for faculty, we should be able to create a greater level of buy-in, thus resulting in more students completing the program. By producing a larger sample size, we can gain a better sense of which objectives are being met and how to address those that are not.

It would have also been beneficial to have collected data indicating how many students attended both the first and second instruction session. Knowing which students attended both sessions versus how many may have only attended one or none, leaves some uncertainty as to the effectiveness of the sessions. Ideally, Freshman Seminar instructors would have provided an incentive for students to attend both sessions and complete the out-of-class assignments and assessments; however, in many of the classes, students were given little or no credit for participating. Librarians did not take roll, thus did not have access to this data.

Although it is unlikely to have affected such a large scoring sample, it is possible that students who completed the pre-test, post-test, and out-of-class assignments had attended neither of the two sessions while still achieving a significant increase in test score. To prevent that scenario in the future, data collection will include a question that asks students if they had attended both sessions.

In addition to measuring traditional learning objectives, it would also be beneficial to add more affective learning questions to the assessment tool in order to help paint a more complete picture of learning outcomes. Future assessments may include methods that measure not only how well students performed in content-based test scores, but how they felt the program has increased their confidence or motivation to become better researchers. This type of data could be extremely useful in further promoting the program to faculty and administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 - Program Outcomes from ACRL, Information Literacy Competency Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard One</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information literate student determines the nature and extent of the information needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Confers with instructors and participates in class discussions, peer workgroups, and electronic discussions to identify a research topic, or other information need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Develops a topic and formulates questions based on the information need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Explores general information sources to increase familiarity with the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Identifies key concepts and terms that describe the information need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The information literate student identifies a variety of types and formats of potential sources for information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Standard Two

The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.

Outcomes:

a. The information literate student selects the most appropriate information retrieval system for accessing needed information
b. Investigates the scope, content, and organization of information retrieval systems
c. The information literate student constructs and implements effectively designed search strategies
d. Identifies keywords, synonyms and related terms for the information needed
e. Constructs a search strategy using appropriate commands for the information retrieval system selected (e.g., Boolean operators, truncation, proximity for search engines, internal organizers such as indexes for books)
f. The information literate student retrieves information online or in person using a variety of methods
g. Uses various classification schemes and other systems (e.g. call number systems or indexes) to locate information resources within the library or to identify specific sites for physical exploration
h. Records all pertinent citation information for future reference

Standard Three

The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically.

Outcomes:

a. The information literate student articulates and applies initial criteria for evaluating both the information and its sources
b. Examines and compares information from various sources in order to evaluate reliability, validity, accuracy, authority, timeliness, and point of view or bias
c. Determines whether information satisfies the research or other information need
d. Draws conclusions based on information gathered
e. Determines probably accuracy by questioning the source of the data, the limitations of the information gathering tools or strategies, and the reasonableness of the conclusions
f. Selects information that provides evidence for the topic
g. Determines whether to incorporate or reject viewpoints encountered

Table 2 - Freshman Seminar In-Class Search Activity

Using the Online Catalog:

1. How many items are available by Emily Dickinson? _____________

2. Let’s say we’re looking for a book called The Old Man and the Sea by Ernest Hemingway. Do a Title search for the book and record the following information:

   How many copies are at UNCP ___ Location ____________________________
   Call Number ____________________________

3. You are given a topic from which to write a paper for a class. The topic is to write an essay that answers the question: What is the importance of having diversity in the classroom? Do a Keyword Search and find two books on this topic that might be useful and write down the title and call number of each.

   Title ___________________________________________________________ Call Number ________________
   Title ___________________________________________________________ Call Number ________________

   For one of the books you wrote down. Look at the subject headings and write down one that may help you to find more books on the same topic. How many books were available for that subject heading?

   Subject heading ___________________________ # of other books ___________
Using An Electronic Resource (Academic Search Complete):

1. You are given a topic from which to write a paper for a class. The topic is to write an essay on the effectiveness of prevention of obesity in children. Conduct a Keyword Search and find one article you think would be useful. Look beyond the first couple of articles listed. The article you choose must be available in full text. Sort by Relevance. Write down the following information:
   How many articles ______ Article Title __________________________
   Source __________________________________________________________________
   Volume# __________ Issue# ______ Keywords used _________________________

   What was it about the article you chose that makes it useful? ________________________________

2. Choose a topic that is of interest to you and try two searches on the same topic using different keywords for each search. List your topic here __________________________
   Search 1: List your keywords ____________________________________________ # of articles____
   Search 2: List your keywords ____________________________________________ # of articles____
   Which search worked better, why? __________________________________________

Table 3 - Scholarly Vs. Popular Assignment

Scholarly Journals versus Popular Magazines Assignment

After reading the Scholarly versus Popular chart on the Blackboard site, you should be able to recognize the difference between periodicals that are popular and those that are considered scholarly. With your newly acquired knowledge, visit the Mary Livermore Library and complete the following questions:

1. Find a popular magazine in the Periodicals area of the Library. Write down the title of the magazine and any date of publication that you can find on the cover or inside. Then find an article in the magazine and write down the title of the article, page number, and the name of the author if there is one. Finally, thumb through the pages and using the characteristics of popular magazines, list three reasons why you believe the publication is popular rather than scholarly.

2. Find the current periodicals in the Library (Ask a librarian if you need assistance). Once you find them, notice the color-coded labels on the shelves with an accompanying three-letter abbreviation. Each periodical title in this section has a corresponding label that designates which academic discipline it should represent. Using the labels, locate a scholarly journal in each of the Education (EDU) and Business (BUS) disciplines. Once you’ve found a scholarly journal for each, write down the following information (again, use the assistance of a librarian if necessary):

   Business
   Title of the Journal: __________________________________
   Volume number: ______ Issue number: ______
   Month/Year: ______
   Pick an article in the journal and write down the title of the article, the author, and the page number. Then list three reasons why you think the journal is scholarly based on the characteristics of scholarly journals.

   Education
   Title of the Journal: __________________________________
   Volume number: ______ Issue number: ______
   Month/Year: ______
   Pick an article in the journal and write down the title of the article, the author, and the page number. Then list three reasons why you think the journal is scholarly based on the characteristics of scholarly journals.
3. Find a computer in the Library. From there, go to the Library’s homepage to search for an electronic journal article (Hint: go to Electronic Resources). Using the database called Academic Search Complete (the one we used in class), find a scholarly article on a topic of your choice. Once you have found the article, write down the following:

Title of the Journal: __________________________________
Volume number: ______  Issue number: ______
Month/Year: ______
Title of the article: __________________________________
Page number ______
Did the article have an abstract? ______
Was the article available in full-text? ______  PDF? ______  HTML? ______
What did you type in the search box? __________________________________
How many results were there? ______

4. Using the same database, look for a popular magazine or newspaper article that discusses “the effects of steroid use in professional sports”. When you type in your keywords, remember only to use the main concepts (in other words, keep it simple and don’t type in too many words). Once you have found the article, write down the following:

Title of the Magazine or Newspaper: __________________________________
Volume number: ______  Issue number: ______
Month/Year: ______
Title of the article: __________________________________
Page number ______
Did the article have an abstract? ______
Was the article available in full-text? ______  PDF? ______  HTML? ______
What keywords did you type in the search box? __________________________________
How many results were there? ______

Table 4 - Website Evaluation Assignment

Website Evaluation Exercise

When conducting academic research, you will sometimes be in need of websites as sources of information, in combination with books and periodical articles. With all of the information available on the Internet these day, it’s important to be able to distinguish which sites are considered acceptable for using in a research paper, and which ones are not.

In this assignment, you will be evaluating three web pages to determine if they are acceptable for using as sources in an academic research paper. Before looking at each site, read the handout given to you in your Freshman Seminar library session entitled “Evaluating Web Resources”. This handout will provide you a set of criteria that you can use to determine the academic value of an Internet website. Be sure to read both sides of the handout carefully. After you have read it, proceed with this worksheet by visiting each website mentioned, and answering the questions that follow. You will be assuming that you are writing a research paper on climate change. Answer each set of questions with the idea that you are examining each site for reliability. After completing this exercise, you should have some sense as to how to evaluate websites for use in future research papers.

Visit the site: http://www.climatechangefraud.com/

1. Accuracy – Explore the website listed above. There is lots of information presented. Does the information seem accurate? Is it verifiable? Why or why not? ____________________________

2. Author – What can we tell about the author of the information? Is there one? Is there an About Us page, and what can we tell from it? ____________________________

3. Bias/Point of View – Does there seem to be a bias in the presentation of the website? If so, discuss in what way there seems to be bias ____________________________
4. Publisher – What is the reputation of the organization publishing the information? Are they well known? Are they qualified to publish information on climate change? Why?

5. Currency – How timely is the information presented? Does it seem up to date?

6. Given the criteria you have used to evaluate this website, would you consider it acceptable to use as a source in a paper on climate change?

Visit the site: http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/

1. Accuracy – Explore the EPA website on climate change. Does the information seem accurate? Is it verifiable? Why or why not?

2. Author – What can we tell about the author of the information? Is there one? Is there an About Us page, and what can we tell from it?

3. Bias/Point of View – Does there seem to be a bias in the presentation of the website? If so, discuss in what way there seems to be bias.

4. Publisher – What is the reputation of the organization publishing the information? Are they well known? Are they qualified to publish information on climate change? Why?

5. Currency – How timely is the information presented? Does it seem up to date?

6. Given the criteria you have used to evaluate this website, would you consider it acceptable to use as a source in a paper on climate change?

Visit the site: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Climate_change


2. Author – What can we tell about the author of the information? Is there one?

3. Bias/Point of View – Does there seem to be a bias in the presentation of the website? If so, discuss in what way there seems to be bias.

4. Publisher – What is the reputation of the organization publishing the information? Are they well known? Are they qualified to publish information on climate change? Why?

5. Currency – How timely is the information presented? Does it seem up to date?

6. Given the criteria you have used to evaluate this website, would you consider it acceptable to use as a source in a paper on climate change?

Finally, perform an Internet search on the topic of climate change or global warming. Write down the name of one website you found that you would consider to be acceptable in using as a source for a paper you are writing. List three reasons why you think the source is legitimate.

Name of website and URL: ____________________________________________

Three Reasons

1. ________________________________________________________________

2. ________________________________________________________________

3. ________________________________________________________________
Table 5  
Information Investigation

Please answer each question as a group and record your group’s answers in the spaces below. Each group member should complete his/her own worksheet and return to the library classroom when you have finished answering each question. If you need assistance with something, you may ask a librarian, but do not expect them to simply give you the answer.

1. Using the online catalog BraveCat, find a book in the Reference collection that discusses some aspect of ‘immigration’. (Hint: Do an Advanced Keyword Search on a topic and limit Location to UNCP Reference) Write down the name of the book and the call number. Locate the book on the shelf, and find a chapter in the book, write down the name of it and what page it starts on.

2. Go to the periodicals area of the Library. Find a current journal in the field of Psychology (use the colored labels to determine the subject). Choose an article and write down the name of the journal, the volume number, the issue number, and the publication date. Locate an article in the journal, then answer the questions below:

What is the title of the article?_________________________________________________________

How many authors are there?_______ Do they work for academic institutions?_______________

Does the article have references at the end?_______ If so, how many?_______________

3. Go to the Electronic Resources page of the Library website. Using the database Academic Search Complete, find a full-text article that deals with the health effects of second hand smoke. Write down the title of the article, the author(s), the name of the journal or magazine it was published in, the volume number, the issue number, the page number(s), and the keywords you used to find it.

4. Using the knowledge you acquired in your assignment about evaluating web sites, locate a credible website on climate change (global warming) Remember to use the criteria you used to determine if a website was reliable or not. Write down the URL (address) of the website, which search engine you used, and then list three reasons why you think this is a reliable website.

Table 6  
Results of Pre-Test/Post-Test (N=77)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>ACRL Standard Addressed</th>
<th>Pre-Test Score (47% mean)</th>
<th>Post-Test Score (71% mean)</th>
<th>Diff. +/- (±24%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>35.23%</td>
<td>70.45%</td>
<td>+35.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>73.86%</td>
<td>+60.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>68.18%</td>
<td>76.14%</td>
<td>+7.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>38.64%</td>
<td>23.86%</td>
<td>-14.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>84.09%</td>
<td>76.14%</td>
<td>-7.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>43.18%</td>
<td>82.95%</td>
<td>+39.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>79.55%</td>
<td>+15.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1: Pre-test

To select your answer for questions 1-7, please write the correct letter on the answer blank.

(1-3.) Correctly identify the parts of the following citation by writing the proper corresponding letter in the blank:


(A) (B) (C) (D) (E) (F) (G)

Sample. Author  __A__

1. Issue Number   ___
2. Journal Title    ___
3. Volume Number   ___

(4-7.) Each of the following items can be useful for finding information. Choose the letter that represents what you can likely expect to find in the resource listed.

4. Reference Book
   A. A short article about a person, place, or event
   B. A long scholarly research article
   C. Both A and B

5. Google
   A. Non-academic websites
   B. Academic websites
   C. Both A and B
6. **Journal**
   A. Advertisements and photographs
   B. Articles with references
   C. Both A and B

7. **Electronic Resources**
   A. A newspaper article
   B. A scholarly journal article
   C. Both A and B

8. Which of the following would you use to search for books on “No Child Left Behind”?
   A. Electronic Resources
   B. Journal Finder
   C. BraveCat
   D. Brave Web

9. You are researching where outbreaks of avian flu have occurred. Which of the following is more likely to be an authoritative source of information?
   A. http://www.cdc.gov/flu/avian/
   B. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Avian_flu
   C. http://avianflu.typepad.com/
   D. http://disease.net

10. You are interested in purchasing a hybrid automobile from a foreign manufacturer. You searched for *Honda* and got 17 hits. Which of the following searches would help you retrieve more than 17 hits?
    A. Honda OR Toyota
    B. Honda AND Toyota

11. You are looking for information on the impacts that global warming has on mammals, birds, and reptiles. In conducting your search in one of the library’s electronic resources, you typed in *global warming* and retrieved over 5,000 articles. Which of the following searches would help you to narrow your results?
    A. global warming and impacts
    B. global warming or greenhouse gases
    C. global warming and animals
    D. global warming or insects

12. A journal article is more likely to have been written by:
    A. A reporter
    B. A professor
    C. A military officer
    D. A stock broker

13. A summary of a journal article is referred to as:
    A. An abstract
    B. Full-text
    C. A PDF
    D. A citation

For questions 14-15, match the correct citation with the citation type by entering a letter in the blank.


   ___


   ___

   A. Journal article citation
   B. Book citation

36 The Southeastern Librarian
16. Which of the following search strategies should be used in an academic database for finding articles on the topic ‘effects of video games on childhood obesity’.
A. children AND obesity
B. video games AND obesity
C. effects of video games on obesity
D. effects AND video games

17. Before you actually begin to look for your resources, it’s best to:
A. Search the Internet
B. Change topics
C. Create a set of keywords
D. Create your bibliography

18. Which of the following is not the name of a collection in the Library?
A. Reference
B. Media
C. American Indian
D. General

19. By using the ‘relevancy’ drop-down menu in an electronic database you are:
A. Starting a new search
B. Sorting the articles by date
C. Weeding out articles that are not full-text
D. Sorting the articles by importance

20. One major difference between a full-text article that is available in HTML format and one that is available in PDF format is:
A. PDF articles are harder to email
B. HTML articles usually do not contain page numbers
C. PDF articles are just plain text
D. HTML articles require special software to print out the article

Appendix 2: Post-test

To select your answer for questions 1-7, please write the correct letter on the answer blank.

(1-3.) Correctly identify the parts of the following citation by writing the proper corresponding letter in the blank:


(A) (B) (C) (D) (E) (F) (G)

Sample. Author _A_

1. Volume Number ___
2. Journal Title ___
3. Article Title ___

(4-7.) Each of the following items can be useful for finding information. Choose the letter that represents what you can likely expect to find in the resource listed.
4. Reference Book
A. A short article about a person, place, or event
B. A long scholarly research article
C. Both A and B

5. Google
A. Non-academic websites
B. Academic websites
C. Both A and B

6. Journal
A. Advertisements and photographs
B. Articles with references
C. Both A and B

7. Electronic Resources
A. A newspaper article
B. A scholarly journal article
C. Both A and B

8. Which of the following would you use to look for books on the topic “use of steroids in sports?”
A. Electronic Resources (databases)
B. Journal Finder
C. BraveCat (online catalog)
D. Brave Web

9. The following call number can be found where in the Library: Ref HA 202.U5 2006
A. UNCP General Collection
B. UNCP Reserves
C. UNCP Reference
D. UNCP Periodicals

10. You are researching the impacts of white collar crime on society. Which of the following is more likely to be an authoritative source of information?
A. http://www.fbi.gov/whitecollarcrime.htm
C. http://embezzlement.blogspot.com/
D. http://www.whitecollarcrimefyi.com/index.html

11. You are conducting research on non-Christian religions. You did a search on Buddhism in a database and retrieved 22 hits. Which of the following revised searches will retrieve more than 22 hits?
A. Buddhism AND Hinduism
B. Buddhism OR Hinduism

12. Which of the following searches in an article database should be used to find information on the topic “how does acid rain impact the environment?”
A. acid rain OR environment
B. acid rain NOT environment
C. acid rain AND environment
D. acid rain
E. environment

13. A scholarly journal is most likely to include:
A. Advertisements
B. Color photographs
C. Technical terminology
D. Articles written by reporters

14. Electronic databases are often organized according to their academic subject. True or false?
A. True
B. False
15. You are writing a paper on the causes of homelessness. Which of the following resources is more likely to provide quality, academic information?
A. WikiPedia
B. Time Magazine
C. The Washington Post
D. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare

16. Before you actually begin to look for your resources, it’s best to:
A. Search the Internet
B. Change topics
C. Create a set of keywords
D. Create your bibliography

17. One major difference between a full-text article that is available in HTML format and one that is available in PDF format is:
A. PDF articles are harder to email
B. HTML articles usually do not contain page numbers
C. PDF articles are just plain text
D. HTML articles require special software to print out the article

18. By using the ‘relevancy’ drop-down menu in an electronic database you are:
A. Starting a new search
B. Sorting the articles by date
C. Weeding out articles that are not full-text
D. Sorting the articles by importance

19. Which of the following domains would be most appropriate for finding reliable information?
A. .edu
B. .com
C. .net
D. None of the above

20. Which of the following is a citation for a periodical article?
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Introduction

New librarians accepting instructional roles in academic libraries inherit classrooms which have evolved beyond the traditional “sage on a stage” model of bibliographic instruction to more active, student-centered information literacy sessions. However, as in the past, these are still primarily one-shot sessions. Assessment is used to make the most of these fifty-minute meetings and might include pre-tests, post-tests, and various classroom assessment techniques (CATs). Assessment provides important benchmark data to measure student information literacy skills, and the results inform and guide instruction librarians. Each assessment method has unique advantages; however, this article will focus specifically on the pre-test and the importance of using pre-test responses in the information literacy classroom. Pre-testing provides one-shot instruction librarians an opportunity to get to know a class prior to instruction. This information should be used to shape the design and content of instruction. In addition, the data should be used and mentioned in the classroom. Exercises reenacting responses from the pre-test may be more meaningful for students than an activity using generic examples. This approach to information literacy instruction is grounded in constructivist logic, because it seeks out a student’s prior knowledge and enables the learner to take an active role in building on that knowledge to incorporate new concepts.

A Constructivist Approach

Pre-testing students prior to their instruction experience and using those results as discussion points and activities in the classroom supports a constructivist approach to teaching and learning. The literature contains many definitions and suggestions for such an approach in the information literacy classroom. Allen (2008) summarized constructivism as a theory in which “…the learner brings to the learning environment knowledge from past experience, and that knowledge has a strong influence upon how the learner constructs meaning and acquires new knowledge from new experiences” (p. 31). Constructivist theory also emphasizes active learning. As Cooperstein and Koevev-Weidinger (2004) explained, active learning is more than providing hands-on activities and allowing students to move around a classroom. Instead, active discovery experiences during instruction should lead to learning, and not the other way around. In other words, instructors should design learning situations that allow for students to make mistakes, from which they can learn. According to constructivist theory, a learner’s mind is not a clean slate. For example, in the case of most college students, learners come into an information literacy session familiar with search engines, such as Google. Students have ideas about where to find information and how to access it, even if it is not always correct. In a constructivist based lesson, the teacher is the facilitator of the learning environment and develops activities in which the learner might detect discrepancies. Pre-tests facilitate this learning process by introducing a concept prior to instruction and allowing a student to reflect on the answer based on his or her current knowledge. In class, the concept is reintroduced, discussed, and experienced in light of the supplied answers on the pre-test. Learners can then build on their previous ideas, readjusting and reshaping their initial thoughts based on class feedback and activity outcomes.

Pre-Testing Literature Review

The literature is filled with examples of assessing before, during, and after one-shot information literacy instruction sessions. As early as 1982, Fields (1987) used pre-test data from more than 400 students to design the content of her lecture. However, there are not many instances examining only the use of a pre-test as an instruction tool. Most often, pre-tests are mentioned as a part of post-tests and are used to measure information literacy skills before and after instruction. Results are used to adjust student learning outcomes and redirect teaching methods in future instruction sessions (Carter, 2002; Emmett & Emde, 2007, and Swoger, 2011).

Some pre/post-test studies place more emphasis on the use of pre-test results in the classroom. Koehler and Swanson (1988) created a four-phase bibliographic instruction approach to teach ESL (English as a second language) students, which included a pre- and post-test phase. The authors conducted a review of the pre-test during the in-class phase, recreating the assessment on the board and seeking student input for the correct answers. Ivanitskaya, DuFord, Craig, and Casey (2008) used a pre- and post-test method to measure information literacy skills of Master’s level students. They found when feedback on the pre-test was provided prior to instruction the effectiveness of instruction was enhanced. The feedback included a narrative explaining how research experience was measured and the importance of the experience. Authors suggested the feedback encouraged students to take library instruction seriously. “Feedback may serve to highlight the discrepancy between their perceived information literacy (which is often inflated) and objectively measured information literacy, thus motivating them to learn” (Ivanitskaya et al., 2008, p. 523).
Dunaway and Orblych (2011) explained how they incorporated pre-tests with formative assessment, which uses “assessment-elicted evidence of students’ learning” (p. 25) to adjust instructional methods. Formative assessment does not focus on one tool, but rather it is a process of using assessment results to continuously improve teaching and learning. In their study, the authors administered a pre-test prior to instruction. The data was used to design the instruction session, which included a set of questions used during the instruction session. This allowed students to “confront their misconceptions of their information literacy skills” (Dunaway and Orblych, 2011, p. 35).

**Pre-Testing at NKU**

At Northern Kentucky University’s Steely Library, a few instruction librarians began experimenting with pre-tests and post-tests in several undergraduate and graduate courses. Librarians were interested in exploring assessment processes and procedures to potentially identify student learning trends and guide future instruction initiatives. Librarians used Google Docs to create a new pre-test for each class. The link to the pre-test was emailed to the class instructor approximately two weeks before the instruction date. This provided plenty of time for students to respond and for the librarian to prepare the class using the responses. The pre-tests were short to encourage participation, usually consisting of no more than five questions. The first question was always a variation of, “Have you ever attended library instruction? If so, in which class(es)?” Other questions were selected based on several factors, including the class assignment, the subject, and the course level. Some example questions are noted in the next section. In spring 2011, the author pre-tested twelve classes. In ten of those classes, more than half the students took the assessment. In fall 2011, pre-tests were sent to nine classes, with all but one class providing at least a fifty percent response rate.

Post-tests were sent out in a similar fashion, one to two weeks after the instruction session. However, the author did not receive high response rates when compared to the pre-test response rate. The author continues to experiment with post-tests and other assessment methods to measure student learning; however, an unexpected outcome during this time was the value the pre-test results provided for creating purposeful, student-centered instruction sessions.

**Using Pre-Test Results in the Classroom**

When preparing for a class, librarians struggle to come up with meaningful examples to illustrate various competencies and guide student learning. Cooperstein and Kocevar-Weidinger (2004) acknowledged designing activities to support a constructivist learning approach takes time. “Finding perfect examples and problems that will lead students to an appropriate ‘Aha!’ experience is difficult…” (p. 145). However, turning to the pre-test can make the process easier. Not only do results help librarians decide which competencies to emphasize, but students provide topic examples and share research experiences. These examples and narratives should be used and discussed in class. The simplest way to accomplish this is to review the results at the beginning of class as Koehler and Swanson (1988) did with their ESL students. At the very least, it provides students the opportunity to see how their responses compared with their peers. However, in addition to, or in place of a review, pre-test results can be incorporated into various learning exercises.

**Pick A Word, Any Word**

This activity involves using student-suggested keywords from the pre-test. For example, the following question was asked on a pre-test for students in an introductory public speaking course:

*Pretend you are researching the topic below. What keywords would you use to search for information? “Should K-12 teachers be ‘friends’ with students on Facebook?”*

On the pre-test, student responses to this question vary from one or two words pulled from the research question to lengthy phrases. A couple of students will add keywords to broaden or narrow the topic. Some students use the Boolean operator, AND. These various suggestions, the good and not-so-good, are written on slips of paper and placed in a jar. In class, students pull out suggested keywords and use them to search a database. Some of the suggestions yield good results, other suggestions are too broad, too narrow, or produce no results. The exercise teaches students the importance of using appropriate terminology. It could also be expanded to include a discussion of subject words.

**Zooming In on Ideas**

A common question the author will present on a pretest helps gauge what students know about the library and how they compare it to searching the Internet.

*How is searching for information on the Internet, using something like Google, different than searching library resources, such as databases?*

Answers to the above question vary, but responses often include variations of these phrases: “Google is not educational”; “It’s [Google] quicker and a lot less time consuming”, “Databases only give scholarly sources”; and “Library resources are more focused”. These and other similar responses provide great discussion points. To display student remarks, the author has used Prezi (http://prezi.com) to create zooming presentations. Students may feel more compelled to join the conversation if they see their response on the board, and it may be helpful for learners to hear peers’ opinions. A similar activity can be done with a variety of questions, including student definitions of peer-review or definitions of primary and secondary sources.
**Can You Find It?**

A pre-test question might ask students to examine a citation and identify the source, such as a book or article. If students incorrect identify the citation on the pre-test, the librarian can provide the citation in class and ask students to find the item. Teachable moments arise when students begin to search the library catalog for an article, or turn to a search engine.

**Selecting Sources**

*Which of the following sources do you plan to use for your upcoming research paper in this class? Check all that apply: Websites, Newspapers, Scholarly Articles, Blogs, Books, Documentaries, Wikipedia, Magazine Articles, Other*

After gathering responses to this question, the librarian can add up the most frequently used and the least used sources. Sharing these results with the class can generate a discussion. Learners may feel the need to defend their choice or they may change their mind after hearing opinions from peers. It can also illustrate the importance of determining one’s information need and deciding which sources are better for a given topic.

**Conclusion**

For the author, approaching an information literacy session without pre-test data is similar to walking into a classroom on the first day of the semester. The students and the instructor are strangers to each other. In a semester-long class, an instructor will gain knowledge about his or her students and adapt lesson plans and approaches to fit the class needs. For librarians teaching a one-shot session, this is not an option. However, pre-testing helps make a connection with the class ahead of time. Furthermore, taking a constructivist approach, pre-tests provide librarians the opportunity to design relevant and authentic activities. For the author, the pre-test provides a sense of confidence she will address the class needs, but more importantly, it helps create meaningful one-shot sessions for students.

**References**


Implementing Discovery at the University of North Alabama

Amy Butler and Leigh Thompson

Amy Butler is an Acquisitions Librarian at the University of North Alabama and can be reached at abgordon@una.edu. Leigh Thompson is and Instructional Services Librarian at the University of North Alabama and can be reached at dlthompson@una.edu.

Background

Collier Library, the main library at the University of North Alabama (UNA), provides the campus community with access to over 150 electronic resources. With so many available options, our students often overlook valuable databases. Analysis of usage statistics had shown that some of our most expensive databases had the highest cost per retrieval. Therefore, finding a product that would encourage users to utilize the full range of available databases became a top priority. In the summer of 2010, the Collier Library staff began to seriously investigate the discovery tool marketplace. We felt that the “single search box” concept of discovery tools and their ability to allow users to seamlessly search multiple databases would be the ideal way to expose students to the range of available databases. We believed that this exposure would increase database use and thus decrease the cost per use. Following discussion and review, the library licensed EBSCO’s Discovery Service (EDS) in late 2010. After months of preparation, setup, and testing, the library launched EDS in spring 2011.

Choosing a Vendor

There were several vendors offering discovery tools when we began exploring the market. As we considered the available products (Summon, Primo, etc.), we focused on certain criteria, such as cost, platform ease of use, and percentage of our databases that could be searched within the product. After receiving quotes from several vendors, viewing online webinars, and attending live demonstrations, we selected EBSCO’s EDS. Our familiarity and comfort with the EBSCOHost interface and the percentage of our resources that would be searchable or included in full-text were the driving factors behind our decision. Since our librarians and users have demonstrated a preference for the EBSCO interface, we already had numerous third-party databases (PsycINFO, MLA, etc.) on the EBSCO platform. This meant that we would be able to search these products within EDS. In addition, our full-text EBSCO periodical databases and electronic books could be easily integrated. An analysis of the indexing in our implementation of EDS revealed that metadata for over 90% of the content in our non-EBSCO databases was available through EDS. EBSCO’s link resolver, LinkSource, would allow users to easily navigate from the metadata to the full-text available on other database platforms (Gale, ProQuest, etc.). Additionally, EBSCO, unlike some of the other vendors, offered the option to federate databases that could not be included in the “foundation” index. Since the federated databases are searched using Z39.50 connections, there is a much slower response time for the resulting citations. Because of this, the results are not displayed by default. Users can choose to view these “additional resources” with a click.

Implementation

Implementation was relatively easy from our standpoint. Initially, we supplied EBSCO with a list of our subscribed databases and completed forms related to catalog records and desired customizations. Our systems librarian worked with EBSCO to determine how best to handle the data extracts from our catalog. Based on our list of subscribed databases, EBSCO completed a resource analysis. This document provided information about the degree to which EDS covered the content in each of the databases. It also gave recommendations on which content could be covered by MARC records in our catalog, which might need to be federated, and which was likely inappropriate for EDS. From this analysis, we found that metadata for the information in most of our databases was adequately covered in EDS. We chose to federate fewer than ten databases. About six weeks after submitting the required information, EBSCO had our EDS up and running, with the exception of the federated search connectors. It took a few more weeks to get those ready. A minor stumbling block arose with our off-campus access. It took several weeks to get this issue resolved. Once that was complete, we entered a testing phase.

Testing and Fine-tuning

After setup was complete, the library began an extended testing period during which the product was advertised to our users as a “beta version.” During this phase, we sent campus-wide emails announcing the service to the university community and promoted the product as a “new service” in person and online. Librarians used departmental contacts to publicize the service to faculty. We provided a feedback form for interested users to offer comments on the service. Comments received were overwhelmingly positive. However, because of the limited response, we sought other avenues for user input.

We conducted a focus group session made up of student writing consultants from the University's Center for Writing Excellence. As an incentive to attend this session, we provided pizza and soda. After a brief overview of the product, we asked the consultants to explore the product and offer feedback. Based upon their input, we made small tweaks in the administration module to some of the EDS limiters. Some of the focus group’s suggestions could not
be implemented using the administration module; we forwarded those we felt would be most beneficial to the vendor for their consideration.

In fall 2011, we removed the “beta” label from the product, officially launching it as “Discovery.” We advertised availability of the service during the library’s Welcome Week event and in other promotional materials.

**Library Instruction & Discovery**

Incorporating Discovery into the library instruction program required careful thought. We began the process by having formal and informal meetings to discuss integrating Discovery into library instruction sessions. The librarians realized there were a number of advantages to including Discovery in library instruction. For us, the biggest advantages were its ability to simultaneously search, through one interface, the library’s catalog and most of our subscription databases. This provides a good starting point for students unfamiliar with the wide variety of resources available. We also felt Discovery would help with the promotion of under-utilized resources and library services, such as Interlibrary Loan and Ask-a-Librarian.

One of the first topics discussed was how to teach Discovery, especially as it related to our information literacy goals for different levels of library instruction sessions. We recognized that in many ways Discovery is like other databases and can be used to teach the same concepts and that the “Google-like” one search box interface would appeal to students.

However, like other researchers (Fagan, 2011; Fagan, 2012; Fagan, Mandernach, Nelson, Paulo, & Saunders, 2012; Fawley & Krysak, 2012), we have found that while discovery tools work well for gaining a broad overview of sources across disciplines, many of the advanced search features and limiters of discipline specific databases are not available. For example, Discovery does not have the “age group” or “population group” limiters that are available in databases such as CINAHL and PsycINFO. In addition, for the limiters that are available in Discovery, (e.g. “language”) if the field doesn’t exist in the metadata for a specific database, citations from this database will not be included in results list. This meant that potentially relevant results would not be retrieved and our concern was that upper-level students, who needed to be familiar with discipline specific databases and search techniques, would not intuitively know to dig deeper and explore individual discipline specific databases.

In deciding how to integrate Discovery into library instruction, we also considered the nature of our instruction program. The majority of our library instruction sessions are one-shot sessions for first and second semester freshman composition courses, so it made sense to begin with these classes. However, our teaching faculty had come to expect that certain resources and services would be covered in each of these sessions. Adding a new element to the traditional sessions required removing some of the topics previously covered or teaching them in a different way.

Many of the introductory composition classes come for library instruction early in the semester before they have a research or library-related assignment. At that point, students are still in the process of adapting to college life and often “tune out” or forget the concepts presented in library sessions because they have no immediate need for the information. The goal of these instruction sessions is to introduce students to the library, without overwhelming them with information. The library session given for the subsequent semester composition class is designed to build upon the first semester experience. This second session is timed to coincide with a research paper project. Students have selected topics, usually for argumentative papers, and they must find a variety of sources to support or oppose their argument. We considered Discovery a logical fit for this project.

In the end, we decided that instruction librarians would briefly introduce Discovery, along with other general databases, in the introductory freshman composition session and deliver more in-depth presentation in the second semester freshman composition course. We designed a hands-on, librarian-guided activity to be completed in the second semester sessions. This activity reinforces information literacy skills that focus on recognizing the wide variety of information sources, distinguishing between formats and audience of potential source, and retrieving information. Since its introduction, the teaching faculty have embraced Discovery and responded favorably to changes in instruction. We also considered how Discovery correlated with the “Standards, Performance Indicators, and Outcomes” of ACRL’s Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education as they are currently written. NOTE: The ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards Review Task Force made a recommendation to the ACRL Information Literacy Standards Committee in ACRL AC12 Doc 13.1 that the Standards “should not be reapproved as they exist but should be extensively revised.” (ACRL AC12 Doc 13.1, p1.) Once the new version of the Standards is approved we will re-evaluate our approach.

When reviewing the standards, we discussed how Discovery could be used to teach or illustrate selected performance indicators and outcomes, as they related to our goals and objectives for freshman composition courses where Discovery would be taught.

For the first and second semester freshman composition courses our main focus had always been on selected outcomes for Standards One and Two, so it was logical to examine these standards as they related to Discovery. These two Standards deal with recognizing an information need and accessing information. After much discussion, we decided that Discovery could best be used to demonstrate Standard One outcomes that focused on finding a wide variety of potential sources (databases), identifying the various formats (books, articles, videos, etc...), recognizing the differences in audience (popular, scholarly, etc...), and
obtaining sources (availability) (1.2c, 1.2d, and 1.3a). Discovery facilitates this in a number of ways. There are facets that allow users to filter by source database and source type, as well as icons that indicate source type. There are also links that guide users through the process of checking for availability of sources.

For Standard Two, outcomes dealing with identifying keywords, developing a search strategy, and retrieving information (2.2b, 2.2d, and 2.3e) were taught. Additional keywords can be identified in Discovery through the use of the “subject terms” facet. These terms can be added to the search string by checking a box beside the desired term(s). Through full-text links and links to check for the availability of an item in the catalog or other databases, users can quickly determine if an article is readily accessible or will require submission of an ILL request. Our link resolver helps simplify this process by searching other databases to find out if the article is available, and if it is unavailable, linking to an ILL form that has been pre-populated with citation information.

While we focus on teaching Discovery primarily in traditional one-shot library instruction sessions for freshman, we also use Discovery to enhance the overall course experience for upper-level students through our embedded librarian service, an extension of the library instruction program. This program, which began in summer 2007, has grown steadily over the past few years, with a number of teaching faculty incorporating more library related assignments and meetings with librarians into their courses. Many of the upper-level classes that include embedded librarians require students to work together on semester-long, collaborative research projects. These student groups often meet with their class librarian multiple times throughout the semester and they needed a tool for tracking and sharing sources. The personalized EBSCO account feature is an invaluable tool for these students. It offers students the ability to set up personal accounts in Discovery, use folder options to save citations and searches, and share folder content with others. Because Discovery includes indexing coverage for most of our non-EBSCO databases, citations from these databases can be saved in the personalized accounts and shared. In some cases, this eliminates the need for additional personal accounts on other database platforms.

Post Implementation Workflows

To ensure that the library’s physical holdings are relatively up-to-date, we extract changed catalog records every Friday and FTP this data to the EDS vendor. We also periodically do a full extract to replace the data on file with EBSCO. Quality control is necessary to ensure that the catalog extracts are capturing all appropriate records. We periodically spot check Discovery to ensure that new records are included, especially when we have used bulk import to add records for a new electronic resource. Several months after adding a new electronic book collection, we discovered that the MARC records for a new set of electronic records did not get sent to EBSCO with the regularly scheduled update file. We were unable to pinpoint the exact cause of this problem. After this, we made the decision to periodically conduct a full extract.

One issue that impacts both cataloging and systems is the loading of MARC records for electronic resources. We now have to think about how database content will be accessed in Discovery. If metadata for the information is already included in Discovery, one consideration is how to exclude the MARC records from our catalog extract to avoid duplication. In the past, we did not always add MARC records for all of the items within a database (e.g., individual streaming videos). To ensure these resources are included in Discovery, we must continually evaluate past practices.

Several months after we officially launched Discovery, we noticed an issue with usage data from one of our vendors. We initially believed that there was a problem with the vendor’s system. After working with appropriate support staff, we determined that the numbers were inflated because of the way the EDS federation works. Because of this, we are no longer using the session and search data for some vendors; instead, we are focusing on the article retrieval statistics. This incidence also triggered reconsideration of the usage statistics that we collect for our EBSCO databases. As all of our subscribed EBSCO databases are included in Discovery, choosing how to report the search and session statistics required attention. Based upon information from selected webinars and the EDS listserv, we revised our EBSCO statistics practices. We now collect session and search data only for the “publisher provided” index. For other EBSCO resources, we collect article retrievals.

Administering Discovery is more time intensive than administering our other databases. In addition to the usual interface customizations such as choosing labels for various limiters and choosing which limiters to display, etc., which are usually done immediately after subscription and tweaked occasionally, EDS requires ongoing administration. As new electronic products are offered, we now have to do the customizations for the native interface and then consider if and how we can include the resource in Discovery.

EBSCO periodically adds new free content to EDS. Initially, we encountered problems because the vendor automatically added this content to our default EDS profile. While we want to provide some of these resources to our users, not all are appropriate for our needs. For example, some of the content is in languages other than English. As there was not always notification that new free content had been added, we found that we had to monitor Discovery closely to ensure that no new databases had been added. We have worked with the vendor to resolve this issue. We have made the default EDS profile a test profile to which EBSCO can add these new, free resources. We created a separate “live” profile that we promote to users.

When non-EBSCO resources are added, we ask EBSCO to add them to our EDS test profile. Then, we test each to ensure it is working properly. Finally, we add the new...
resources to the relevant EDS profiles. As we have created multiple subject-specific EDS search profiles, we must ensure that new databases are added to all appropriate profiles after testing.

In addition to the ongoing maintenance tasks associated with the interface, there is a need to monitor the EDS listserv to determine if any new features/resources have become available. There may also be a need to tweak the interface as feedback is received from faculty and students. We are still working to determine the individuals within our library to be responsible for each of these tasks.

**Future Plans**

As Fagan pointed out in a recent *Journal of Web Librarianship* editorial, many librarians have a tendency to think that their discovery tool is the “biggest and/or best” (2012). While we are very happy with EDS, we continue to monitor the marketplace going forward. We are currently investigating next generation ILS products. As we talk with vendors, each is pushing the benefits of using a combination of their ILS and discovery product. While most say that their ILS will work with other discovery tools, they are quick to point out that it will work better with their own discovery product. In many cases, access to features such as saved lists is not yet available through other vendors’ discovery tools. We currently have that problem with Discovery. For users to perform tasks tied to their “library” account (place holds, renew books, etc.), they must go to the OPAC. While we are not interested in changing vendors, we recognize the possibility exists that it could one day become necessary to do so. This is one of the reasons that we chose to brand our product simply “Discovery.” We did not want to include a vendor name in the tool because we recognize that at some point our needs might change. Given the positive response to Discovery, we appreciate that our users will continue to expect the features available through discovery products. Whatever the future holds, we are committed to meeting these expectations.

**References**


BOOK REVIEWS


What happens when a southern town revisits a 25-year-old massacre in which five anti-Klan demonstrators are killed and ten injured? Would revisiting that incident bring the community closer together and determine why it happened in the first place? Or would it divide residents even more and make survivors relive old wounds?


The focus of the book looks at the day when members of the Communist Workers Party [CWP] staged a well-publicized anti-Klan demonstration in a black public housing neighborhood in Greensboro. The CWP had hoped to use the anti-Klan rally to end the perceived exploitation of workers of a textile mill, one of the state’s largest employers. But to do that, they felt they had to end the Klan’s influence over Greensboro residents.

Meanwhile, the Klan itself had much different plans for the day.

A convoy of Nazis and Klan members drove by the parade in a caravan nine cars long, hurling racial epithets, prompting the demonstrators to chant back insults of their own. The demonstrators used parade signs and feet to hit and kick the cars.

Soon after, 88-seconds worth of gunshots were fired from someone in the caravan, leaving five protestors dead and ten injured. Two of those injured were a Klansman and a TV cameraman. The rest were protestors.

Within days, the TV-News-videotaped incident would leave some disturbing questions: How could the Greensboro tragedy happen? And would Greensboro ever gain perspective on that day.

Jovanovic spends the majority of her 226 page book telling her reading audience how a town-based Commission tried to answer questions about the massacre—often referred to in the book as simply “November 3, 1979.”

The Greensboro Truth and Reconciliation Commission [TRC], was formed in 2004 for the purpose of looking at the causes and consequences of what happened in 1979. The TRC was initiated to take public testimony and examine the causes, sequence of events, and consequences of the massacre.

The TRC spent two years studying November 3. The TRC held public hearings giving both survivors and perpetrators of November 3 the opportunity to speak.

The formation of the Greensboro TRC was founded on the idea of Ubuntu. This concept, started in Africa, believes that the community as a whole is a requisite for addressing human rights violations.

Dialogue is a key concept of the TRC. In doing so, they brought together survivors, perpetrators, and the community to talk about November 3.

And the more the TRC deliberated, the more questions were asked: Why did the shooters of November 3 all evade imprisonment? Where were the police during the shooting? Did either side (anti-Klan demonstrators and the Klan itself) incite violence that day?

To attempt to answer those questions, the TRC had a year’s worth of public hearings. This included both Cleveland, North Carolina Klansman Virgil Griffin stating that the NAACP was comparable to the Klan. In contrast, Jovanovic herself states that “while the Klan and Nazi passions of hatred and bigotry must be rejected, their experiences as members of the exploited working class are worthy of sensitive discussions.”

Jovanovic, a UNC at Greensboro communication studies professor, collaborated with other Greensboro residents to document the effort to form the first TRC in the United States.

Jovanovic’s book takes a thorough look at a culture which is still affected by the shooting years later. Through her book, Spoma facilitates a discussion about the possibility of reconciliation and forgiveness, as well as what happens if those two occurrences don’t take place.
Democracy, Dialogue and Community Action is an excellent starting point for that discussion.

This book is recommended for academic and public libraries.

Peter R. Dean
University of Southern Mississippi


The beautiful brilliant author Susan Puckett is from Jackson, Mississippi. The initial Delta eating place Susan ate with a boyfriend from Ole Miss is Lusco’s of Greenwood renowned for small rooms with curtains for each dining party, pompano fish, gumbo, shrimp, steaks, and spinach soufflé. The splendid work has connection to the Southern USA by author Susan Puckett who is from Jackson, Mississippi and the content of the monograph is the history and discussion of spots to eat in the Delta of Tennessee and Mississippi. The writing style is superior. The content is magnificently researched and presented. The perceived interest to the readership of the journal is outstanding because of the numerous variety of delicious food and entertaining sites and activities illustrated that are available to people, tourists, and librarians in the Southeastern United States.

For example, alluringly, Memphis welcomes visitors with the beautiful Peabody Hotel on the National Register of Historic Places and its Chez Philippe Restaurant and Capriccio Grill. Memphis also delights people with the residence of Elvis Presley, Graceland. The book discloses instructions for banana and peanut butter on bread that Elvis Presley and his family enjoyed. Tunica casinos enrich visitors such as Paula Deen’s southern all you can eat buffet at Tunica’s Harrah’s for five hundred sixty persons. Clarksdale directs a Tennessee Williams Festival due to Tennessee Williams being there as a child. Oxbow Restaurant of Clarksdale, noted in the periodicals People and Travel and Leisure, and on the Travel Channel, entices patrons with tacos and tuna stuffing and hummus using black eyed peas.

Additionally luring, B.B. King is from Sunflower County where the fourteen million dollar B.B. King museum is located. Jim Henson, creator of Kermit the Frog and the Sesame Street muppets was from Leland, Mississippi where the Leland Chamber of Commerce oversees a Sesame Street museum. The boulevard entry road to Greenwood displays palatial regal residences that Garden Clubs of America and US Chamber of Commerce remarked as one of the most gorgeous areas. Humphrey’s County is the catfish capital, although the one hundred thousand acres of farms of catfish has lessened from 1990. Greenwood’s Larry’s Fish House produces catfish. In September, Cleveland’s Sillers Coliseum offers for two dollars hundreds of rice dishes in honor of National Rice Month. Greenwood’s The Alluvian Hotel is like a Europe hotel with baths, spas, and a steak house.

Also enchanting, the museum of the initial Coca-Cola bottling is the Vicksburg Biedenharn Candy Company Museum of Coca-Cola. The tapestry pilgrimage reveals Vicksburg’s lavish mansions and eateries. Cedar Grove Mansion Inn Restaurant and Bar has the best dining room in Vicksburg with beautiful statues. Vicksburg National Military Park draws people. Tamales are the best fare of Delta. Tamales originated from Mexican labor. The wonderful book covers twenty-two eating establishments that serve tamales and makes known a Mississippi Delta tamale recipe. Delta Magazine of Cleveland shares recipes and occurrences and eateries in the region guests would
like. This stunning success is paramount for academic and public libraries and is beyond price to people interested in the Delta.

Melinda F. Matthews
University of Louisiana at Monroe


In the book, "George Keats of Kentucky: A Life", any reader will be immediately drawn to the family connection that highlights this biography. Written by Lawrence M. Crutcher with a foreward by John E. Kleber, this 342 page publication sets a delightful pace and maintains it as the story unfolds.

Mr. Crutcher is a Former President of Book of the Month club and currently is a corporate director. Mr. Crutcher is a great-great-great grandson of George Keats and author of another book, The Keats Family.

*George Keats of Kentucky: A Life* begins with an introduction of the biography of George Keats by alerting us quickly to the relationship between George Keats and the famous English writer and brother, John Keats. Taking us to the towns of Henderson, Kentucky, and soon thereafter to Louisville, we see George plunge into business ventures and became a community leader and respected entrepreneur using the natural resources that abounded in the newly developing country during the early 1820s in lumber mills, steamboats, and real estate, George made connections and led business associates. By 1828, George was highly connected with local entrepreneurs and flourished financially.

The table of contents gives the reader a look at periods in George’s life that defined his challenges and successes as a leader in his community in Louisville and shed light on his family in England, especially his famous brother, John Keats. One such chapter, entitled, “Who Failed the Poet?” leads the reader to ponder four questions: was it (George) his brother who failed to provide financial support to John, was it his doctors who failed to treat his illnesses, was it his critics who failed to give him open minds, or was it the poet himself who cared little for his personal health.

The book jacket and photograph that stares out at the reader presents a sophisticated, quite British subject with elegant dress with an open innocent stare—not a dandy but certainly the look of privilege. The reader is immediately drawn to the mystery behind the face and the innocence apparent of any hard and grueling impacts his life may have faced.

For a scholar of John Keats, the author’s research, almost painstaking, gives many avenues to investigate the 1800s in Kentucky life and times. Family interactions and stressful concerns about a family divided by allegiances to both England and to the new life in America tugged at the familial connections between the brothers and their families. While George appears to keep his family ties in England alive, he can be seen to grow tired of his brother’s complacency and the lack of strong dedication to the achievement motives he felt so dramatically in the newly developing Kentucky.

A beautiful collection of color plate photographs, depicting the life and the acquaintances and scenes from George and his family life and surroundings, add greatly to the imagination of the life and times of George Keats. The author of the work diligently searched and bought forth items and related information on the cultural and sociological background that is highlighted through the biography.

The Appendices --Circle of Friends and Acquaintances, Pertinent Documents, Events in the Life of George Keats, the Notes, Bibliography and Illustration Credits bring invaluable resources to an historian searching for documentation for on-going research on the life of the Keats families and the history of early Kentucky cultural and sociological development of real estate, banking, manufacturing and shipping.

The issue for the reader of this book may be the desire to know more of the life of George Keats’ brother, John. At first glance, *George Keats of Kentucky: A Life* may appear to be another biography but the tact with which the author draws the reader into the story by weaving George’s relationship with his famous brother, the renowned English poet, John, keeps the reader involved and that character development does not falter as the story unfolds. The book will be helpful to historians as it creates highlights of the rich cultural and social fabric of life in 1800s in Kentucky!

Dr. Carol Walker Jordan
Queens University of Charlotte

This beautifully presented story of the life and career of Helen Matthews Lewis is a jewel for anyone’s library who is fascinated by the history of Appalachian culture and the social movements in the years between the 1960s and the present day. A revealing portrait of a woman seemed called to identify, examine and find ways to make life better for those she met and chose to help. Time spent reading the biographical review of Helen’s childhood, intervening years and final years of this scholar and social humanitarian will reward the reader. One can see Helen as a little girl absorbing the social discriminations around her and reflecting upon those as driving forces in her choice of research as a social counselor and activist. To learn about her linking of human and cultural observations to her plans to make life better for others is truly inspiring. Her social justice career spanned issues that are relevant today around the world. Concern for the plight for the less fortunate, concern for the environment, concern for health and wellness, concern for sustainability of all good things may remind us of humanitarians serving today in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and those areas near and far in our hemisphere—those whom we know are the struggling victims of quiet desperation anywhere in the world.

Helen’s 12 Step Plan to improve and sustain communities that present cultural ills similar to the towns and villages of Appalachia is a visionary creation of someone who lived and worked to bring wellness, productivity and hope. It might be said that one must live poverty and its ravages to be able to know what must be done to truly help. Also steps and time as reflected in Helen’s revelations unveil truths only learned by patience, hope and reflection. Anyone with a passion for finding ways to live one’s own life in service to others will truly enjoy “Helen Matthews Lewis: Living Social Justice in Appalachia”.

Dr. Carol Walker Jordan
Queens University of Charlotte


In this concise but extremely thorough book, Lois Hamill, University Archivist at Northern Kentucky University bridges the gap for individuals and smaller institutions that need to organize what may often be long neglected collections. In this era of resource constraint, Lois takes a methodical approach to the description of these items, relying heavily on the affordable Past Perfect Software which can generate museum quality records for the beginner, with the informed narrative from Ms. Hamill to lead the way.

Replete with templates and appendices of needed documentation, Ms. Hamill builds on her initial definitions of archival terms with specific application of method to the process of building a collection, frequently referring to fundamental concepts to reinforce each phase of the process. This approach supplies both the how and the why for the uninitiated, making the development of the collection follow a logical and scholarly path. The book is full of specific recommendations and processing details for the fledgling archivist, such as the purchase of acid free folders and use of the number two pencil for marking items; small things perhaps, but nonetheless important, as anyone who has tried to digitize a photo with markings reverse embossed on its face from someone marking the item with a ball point pen will attest to.

The most challenging issue for any archivist or institution must be the often murky area of ownership, which Ms. Hamill deals with in her explanation of the PANE principal, an acronym for Purpose, Amount, Nature and Effect to evaluate the property rights attached to an item. For example, if someone hires a photographer to take wedding photos, where do the intellectual property rights lie? Since the photographer is the creator of the photo, he or she retains the rights to their publication, just as the original subject must go back to the photographer to obtain copies.
Ms. Hamill sets up several concrete examples to illustrate how these determinations are made, and more importantly, the necessary documentation for institutions to protect themselves as items go on display, or are reproduced.

Physical exhibitions of items with reference to display, lighting and security and the conditions of archival storage are each dealt with in turn. Also the conditions of loaning items and publicity for an upcoming exhibition are illustrated. This particular chapter resonated with this reader, as I recently viewed “The America I Am” exhibit touring Charlotte, and attended a talk given by the curator, John Fleming, who gave a post event appreciation for the protracted negotiations and preparation needed to make this event possible. Ms. Hamill focuses on the preparation for such displays in her signature methodical style.

The final chapters deal with the odd elements in any collection, those that often do not easily fit in the easily cataloged world of manuscripts and photographs. Movie film, for example, how should it be preserved? Textiles? Plaques and architectural objects? Items with three dimensions? And what of vinyl records? All of these items have their own specific preservation requirements that are detailed in this work and finally the most important items for last: who will do the work and what happens when disaster strikes? The use of volunteer labor is essential for smaller institutions attempting to collect, describe and preserve their cultural heritage but this can often be problematic, as the lack of expertise and the diminished commitment over time for those in unpaid positions becomes evident. This can often be seen in the faces of student volunteers when handing them a stack of photos to be digitized. Sadly, it is often true that prime real estate in any institution is not reserved for the archives. Basement storage with its lack of environmental controls and a myriad of drain pipes hanging overhead like a blade attached to a descending pendulum threaten the very items we wish to preserve.

So, I must give praise to Ms. Hamill for pulling together so much useful information in a single volume. Yes, in this age of electronic information so readily at one’s demand, it can be incredibly time consuming to visit first one site and then another, following the trail from the Getty to the VRA Core elements website looking for exactly the right information to make a credible, scholarly collection. If there was one ready reference work I would recommend to someone commencing an archival collection it would be the *Archives for the Lay Person*. Ms. Hamill has given us a roadmap, folded neatly. We need only drive.

*Martin F. Olsen*

Queens University of Charlotte


To date, very few works have been published about the shag, the official state dance of both North and South Carolina. *Save the Last Dance* by Phil Sawyer and Tom Poland is the first to be published by a university press, and focuses on the history and cultural impact of the dance itself as well as the Society of Strangers, a group dedicated to the dance’s continuing legacy.

Author Dr. Phil Sawyer, a retired university professor, is president emeritus of the Society of Strangers and a recipient of the group’s Lifetime Achievement award in 2011. Author Tom Poland has written numerous books and articles on topics relating to South Carolina and Southern history.

The book tells the story of the shag dance from its beginnings, including both the documented history and the legends. Along the way it paints a lively and vivid picture of the lives of shag dance and beach music enthusiasts on the North and South Carolina coast during the 1940s, 1950s and beyond. Woven throughout each chapter are personal anecdotes from the people who were there, which illuminate the historical and cultural analysis and become part of the “love story” of the dance alluded to in the book’s well-chosen subtitle. *Save the Last Dance* also includes photographs of important places, people, and events relating to the history of the dance and the establishment of the Society of Strangers.

Other recent publications related to the shag focus on giving a pictorial history of the dance (*Shagging in the Carolinas*, Arcadia Press, 2005) and on profiling popular shag music and recording artists (*Carolina Beach Music*, History Press, 2011). Libraries which already own these two titles will want to purchase *Save the Last Dance* to add its historical and cultural overview to complement their collection. All libraries where there is strong interest in dance, music history and Southern culture should also consider adding this book.

*Allison Faix*

Coastal Carolina University
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